

European University Institute  
**Department of History and Civilization**

Civilization, Culture, and Race in John Crawfurd's Discourses on  
Southeast Asia:

Continuities and Changes, c.1814-1868

Martin Müller

Thesis submitted for assessment with a view to  
obtaining the degree of Doctor of History and Civilization  
of the European University Institute

**Examining Board**

Prof. Sebastian Conrad, Freie Universität (Supervisor)  
Prof. Jorge Flores, EUI  
Prof. Michael Harbsmeier, Roskilde Universitet  
Dr. Christina Skott, University of Cambridge

© Martin Müller, 2013

No part of this thesis may be copied, reproduced or transmitted without prior  
permission of the author



## **Abstract.**

In this dissertation I examine the uses of the notions of civilization, race, and culture within a set of British 19<sup>th</sup> century discourses on especially Southeast Asian societies, their present state and history. Taking the point of departure in John Crawfurd's (1783-1868) publications, it contains a study of the many debates on economic, ethnological, historical, and linguistic issues in which he participated throughout six decades and to which he contributed significantly. Through this approach I aim at providing a densely contextualized analysis of the colonial, intellectual, political, and socio-cultural aspects of Crawfurd et al's knowledge production, its routes of transmission, receptions, and appropriations. The analytic focus is directed at the evaluative-descriptive qualities attributed to the terms civilization, race, and culture, and immanent in the concepts they refer to; on the surface claiming to be primarily descriptive, they nonetheless were normatively cogent in their inherent hierarchal and classificatory structures, as well as in providing a theoretical template delineating the naturalized historical trajectories.

Arguing that the notions of civilization, race and culture were pivotal key concepts in this colonial knowledge production, I chart the intertwined dynamics between these notions – both in their conceptual framings and contextualized uses. During this quest I endeavour to demonstrate the interpretive primacy of the concept of civilization throughout the entire period, even though racial concerns clearly were on the ascendancy and by the 1860s constituted the major theme of discussion and dissent. Common to all the analysed discourses is that they were hinged upon these three fundamental notions and their ability to address the universal as well as the particular, their capacity to encompass the past, present and future within one interpretive framework, and not at least their provision of a conceptual common ground which also, however, facilitated the possibilities of fundamental dissent within the actual interpretations.

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Fields, Scope, Approaches, and Spatio-Temporal Demarcations.....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Fields, Approaches, and Subject Areas.....	4
1.2 Spatio-temporal Demarcations.....	6
1.3 Hypotheses.....	7
<b>2. From Theory to Methodology.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Texts and Contexts.....	8
2.2 Interpretive Frameworks, Strategies of Reading, and Hermeneutic Scales.....	9
2.3 The Past in the Present and the Present in the Past: the Historian's Tools.....	11
<b>3. Historiography.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4. The Life and Careers of John Crawford.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5. The Source Material.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>6. Content and Structure.....</b>	<b>29</b>
 <b>Part I. Enter Civilization: Conceptualizing Civilization and Colonizing the Past.....</b>	 <b>33</b>
<b><i>0. Crawford and Civilization.....</i></b>	<b><i>35</i></b>
<b><i>1. Contextualizing and Conceptualizing Civilization and Culture.....</i></b>	<b><i>37</i></b>
1.1 Defining and Demarcating Civilization.....	38
1.2 Challenging Civilization and Posing Culture as a Counter-Concept.....	43
1.3 From Civilization to Civilizations: Consistency and Change in Crawford's Text.....	48
<b><i>2. Conjectural History, Colonial Engagements, and Crawford's Historiography.....</i></b>	<b><i>57</i></b>
<b>2.1 The Concept of Civilization within the Scottish Tradition.....</b>	<b>58</b>
2.1.1 The Scottish Socio-Cultural Context.....	59
2.1.2 Framing Conjectural History.....	63
<b>2.2 Delineating Conjectural History's Time and Space.....</b>	<b>67</b>
2.2.1 Delineating the Dynamics between History's Subject Areas.....	68
2.2.2 From a Timeless Space towards Spatialized Time.....	71
2.2.3 Methodologies and Modes of Inferences: The Question of Private Property.....	74

<b>2.3</b>	<b>Crawfurd as a Conjectural Historian: Content and Approaches.....</b>	<b>76</b>
2.3.1	Approaching, Classifying, and Structuring the Indian Archipelago and Its History.....	78
2.3.2	Defining the Stage of Civilization and Identifying the Causes of Progress.....	85
<b>3.</b>	<b><i>From Explaining Race to Racial Explanations: The Case of the Eastern Negroes.....</i></b>	<b>93</b>
3.1	Explaining Race and Civilization: Causally Linked or Co-Extensional Entities?.....	93
3.2	From Eastern Negro to Eastern Negroes: Racial Classification and Gradual Civilization.....	96
3.3	Extent of Information, Degrees of Knowledge, and Explanatory Modes..	104
3.4	Conclusion.....	106
<b>Part II. Space, Time, Movement: Geographical Configurations, Historical Periods, and the Travelling Gaze.....</b>		<b>109</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b><i>Twixt Asia and Oceania: Negotiating the Geographical Place of the ‘Indian Archipelago’ in British Discourses.....</i></b>	<b>111</b>
1.1	Between India and the Deep Blue Sea: An Early Debate.....	111
1.1.1	Determining and Delineating the Indian Archipelago as an Analytical Space.....	114
1.2	Locational Techniques: Defining and Describing Spaces.....	116
1.3	Placing a Name, Naming the Place: Conceptualizing through Denomination.....	119
1.3.1	W. Marsden between the Malay Archipelago and Hither Polynesia.....	121
1.3.2	The Malays and the Dual Character of J. Leyden’s Indo-Chinese Nations.....	124
1.3.3	Crawfurd’s Route to the Indian Archipelago.....	126
1.3.4	From Polynesia to Oceania: The Same in All but Name?.....	129
1.3.5	Discerning the Indian Archipelago within the Indian Archipelago.....	132
1.3.6	The Aftermath of the Indian Archipelago in the Metropole.....	134
1.3.7	A.R. Wallace’s Malay Archipelago: A Return to the Beginning?.....	137
1.4	Conclusive Remarks.....	139

<b>2. <i>The Vicissitudes of Southeast Asian Chronologies</i></b>	<b>141</b>
2.1 Chronological Principles and Methods	141
2.2 Identifying the First Inhabitants in the Indian Archipelago	143
2.3 Identifying and Dating the Influences from India	146
2.4 Dating the History of the Malay Nation and Tracing Its Migrations	152
2.5 The Chronology of the Modern History of the Indian Archipelago	159
2.6 Conclusion	163
<b>3. <i>Observing, Documenting, and Interpreting Oriental Despotism in Crawfurd's Travelogues</i></b>	<b>165</b>
3.1 Historical Context: 'Oriental Despotism' and the Mode of Governance in India and Southeast Asia	168
3.2 Observing 'Oriental Despotism': Morphology of a Travelling Gaze	171
3.2.1 Crawfurd as a Writer of Travelogues	173
3.2.2 Construing from Absence: Observing through Seeing What is not There	175
3.2.3 Shapes of Despotism and Shades of Orientalism	179
3.2.3.1 Oriental Despotism and Social Mobility	180
3.2.3.2 Observing High Wages, Inferring Oriental Despotism	183
3.3 The Origin of Oriental Despotism in Crawfurd's Conjectural History	189
3.4 Colonial Administration	195
3.5 Adequate Spatializations, Authentic Explanations, and Authoritative Modes of Knowing	197
3.5.1 Raffles's on the Origin of 'Oriental Despotism' in the Indian Archipelago	197
3.5.2 The "Raffles-Crawfurd Controversy": Claiming Authority & Authenticity	200
3.5.3 Conjectural History and Orientalism: Discrepancies and Overlapping	205
3.6 Diplomacy and 'Oriental despotism'	207
3.7 Conclusion	209

<b>Part III. Words Don't Come Easy. Philology, Epistemology, and Politics in the Knowledge of the 'Other'</b> .....	<b>213</b>
<b>0. <i>Philology and Its Intellectual Contexts</i></b> .....	<b>215</b>
<b>1. <i>Contextualizing Crawford's Theories of Language</i></b> .....	<b>221</b>
1.1 The Scriptures, Genealogy, History, and Ethnology.....	221
1.2 Progress, Civilization, and Language.....	225
1.3 Crawford's Theories of Language and Their Intellectual Contexts.....	230
1.3.1 Faith and the Origin(s) of Mankind and Language.....	230
1.3.2 The Tensions between the Universal and the Particular in Languages.....	232
1.3.3 Crawford and His Philosophical Sources.....	239
1.3.3.1 Consuming, Appropriating, and Occluding Horne Tooke's Theories and Approaches..	239
1.3.3.2 Adam Smith: Complexities of Language and Levels of Abstraction.....	243
1.3.4 Assessments.....	248
<b>2. <i>Methodological Approaches and Produced Evidence</i></b> .....	<b>251</b>
2.1 The 'Word List' and the Establishment of Genealogical Affinity.....	251
2.2 Genealogy Adduced from Other Sources: J.D. Lang's Argumentation....	260
2.3 Crawford's Critique of the 'Word List'.....	262
<b>3. <i>Crawford's Approaches, Theories, and Interpretations</i></b> .....	<b>269</b>
3.1 Linguistic Amalgamation and Progress of Civilization: Crawford's Linguistic Palaeontology I.....	269
3.2 Disentangling Language and Race.....	272
3.3 Lexicography and Civilization: Crawford's Linguistic Palaeontology II....	276
3.4 Discerning Levels of Linguistic Interaction: Crawford's Cluster Theory..	286
3.4.1 <i>Loanwords</i> , Waves of Diffusion, and Levels of Civilization.....	286
3.4.2 Defining, Delineating, and Demarcating a <i>Language</i> .....	288
3.4.3 The Exception: Tracing Genealogy and Diffusion in the Pacific.....	290
3.4.4 Crawford's Analytical Tools: Orthography, Grammar & Lexicography.....	295
3.5 A Final Reflection: Crawford and Some Recent Objections.....	303

<b>Part IV. From Language to Biology. Race, Nation, and Civilization as Demarcation Criteria, Descriptive Units and Historical Factors, 1810-1869.....</b>	<b>309</b>
<b><i>0. Discursive Moments in the Debates on the Indian Archipelago.....</i></b>	<b><i>311</i></b>
<b><i>1. A ‘Strait’ Story: the Formative Years up to c.1820.....</i></b>	<b><i>315</i></b>
<b>1.1 Malay, Polynesian, and Malayo-Polynesian: Entanglements and Conflations.....</b>	<b>315</b>
<b>1.2 Tracing the Malayan Seat of Origin.....</b>	<b>317</b>
1.2.1 British Discourses on Sumatra before Marsden’s “History of Sumatra”.....	317
1.2.2 Early Malay Dictionaries in a New Imperial Context: Bowrey to Howison.....	318
1.2.3 War and Empire: the Colonial Context of the <i>First Discursive Moment</i> .....	322
1.2.4 Leyden on the Origin and History of the Malay Language and Nation.....	324
1.2.5 Raffles’ Discourses on the Malay <i>Nation</i> and <i>Race</i> .....	328
1.2.6 Marsden on the Seat of Origin of the Malay Nation and Language.....	332
1.2.7 Crawford’s Earliest Discourse of the Malays: a Maritime <i>Civilization</i> ?.....	337
1.2.8 Beyond the Scholar-Administrators I: Jambulus’ Objections.....	343
1.2.9 Beyond the Scholar-Administrators II: John Hunt on the Malays.....	344
1.2.10 A Return to Orthodoxy? On the Origin of the Malay <i>Nation and Civilization</i> in HIA.....	347
<b>1.3 British Discourses on the ‘Madagascar Problem’: A Non-Issue in the 1810s and 1820s.....</b>	<b>349</b>
1.3.1 Marginalising Madagascar in Marsden’s Discourse.....	350
1.3.2 Crawford on Madagascar in HIA: A Note on the Sources of Knowledge.....	350
1.3.3 Appropriating a Continental Approach: Chamisso and Malte-Brun.....	353
<b>1.4 Concluding Remarks.....</b>	<b>355</b>
<b><i>2. “1834”: Thematic Convergences, Theoretical Discord.....</i></b>	<b><i>357</i></b>
<b>2.1 The Contexts.....</b>	<b>357</b>
2.1.1 From Scholar-Administrator to Metropolitan Savant.....	357
2.1.2 Committed to a Cause: Crawford’s Political Affiliations and Oriental Scholarship.....	359
2.1.3 Missionaries, Scholars, and Administrators.....	363
2.1.4 From Theorist to Provider of Information: W. Humboldt and Crawford.....	368
<b>2.2 The Intertextual Entanglements.....</b>	<b>370</b>
2.2.1 A Swan Song: Marsden’s Last Disquisition.....	370
2.2.2 Crawford’s Course from Polynesia to Oceania.....	375
2.2.3 Lang’s Original Malays: The Founders of Southeast Asian Civilization.....	378
2.2.4 W. von Humboldt’s Grand Synthesis.....	381



<b>2.3 Concluding Remarks.....</b>	<b>386</b>
<b>3. <i>Apotheosis: Crawford as the Uncontested Malayan Authority</i>.....</b>	<b>391</b>
<b>3.1 Malayan Ethnology and Philology in 1840s: Prichard to Crawford.....</b>	<b>392</b>
3.1.1 Crawford and the Institutionalisation of Ethnological Studies in Britain.....	392
3.1.2 Crawford and J.C. Prichard's Malayo-Polynesian Language and Race.....	395
3.1.3 Contextualizing "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races".....	400
3.1.4 Concluding Reflections.....	403
<b>3.2 The Receptions of the "Grammar and Dictionary" and the "Descriptive Dictionary".....</b>	<b>405</b>
3.2.1 Assessing Crawford's Philological Theory: Erskine Perry.....	408
3.2.2 Assessing Crawford's Philological Theory: Max Müller.....	411
3.2.3 Convergent Contexts: Luke Burke's Racialized Reading of Crawford.....	417
<b>3.3 J.R. Logan's Notions of Race, Language, and Civilization.....</b>	<b>425</b>
<b>4. <i>The Marginalised Malay? Crawford's 1860s Discourses</i>.....</b>	<b>431</b>
<b>4.1 Crawford's Career in the Ethnological Society.....</b>	<b>431</b>
<b>4.2 From Philology to Prehistory? Ethnologizing the Malayan Past.....</b>	<b>434</b>
<b>4.3 Resurrecting Prichard: Crawford's Rhetorical Archenemy.....</b>	<b>438</b>
<b>4.4 The Wallace-Crawford Divide: A Tale of Authority.....</b>	<b>440</b>
<b>4.5 Crawford's Last articles on the Malayan and Polynesian Races.....</b>	<b>446</b>
<b>4.6 Concluding Remarks.....</b>	<b>448</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>451</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>463</b>

## Acknowledgements.

A work of this magnitude is obviously not the production of one single mind alone. Indeed no academic work is; beneath the fictitious varnish of authorial originality all scholarly endeavour is by its nature collective. Not only do all scholars stand upon the shoulders of former giants and constantly engage in debates with their colleagues and competitors, but they invariably also beg, steal, and borrow from these, more often than not without acknowledging or probably even knowing it! This attempt at an academic production without doubt betrays many of these traits; thus, the only thing that I am truly responsible for here are the many errors and even more frequent instances of obfuscation in formulation or thought.

Amongst those whose assistance has been most beneficial to execution of this project is my supervisor, Dr. Sebastian Conrad, whose infinite patience and profoundly humanistic way of supervising are only outshined, perhaps, by his analytic acumen and historical diligence. Under his mild, yet vigilant gaze my proclivities towards tedious digressions and lengthy detours have been curbed and the argumentative structure been straightened up. Obviously, any flaws and inconsistencies that persist are entirely my own.

I have also prospered immensely from commentaries and criticism occurring at the seminars and conferences organized by the department of European History and Civilization (HEC) at the EUI, as well from the more informal conversations on my project that I have had with many of the professors, fellow researchers, and staff members (both former and present) belonging to this department.

A deep gratitude towards the many nameless but never anonymous members of the library staffs at especially the EUI Library and at the British Library is entirely due too. They have always greeted me with a kind smile and provided an excellent service; incarnating an immaculate professionalism they simply do not seem to have had the word “no” incorporated into their working vocabulary! Thanks to their efforts I have been able to procure even the obscurest source-material, and simultaneously they have also facilitated all the up-to-date literature absolutely necessary for undertaking such a project as this. Neither would this project have appeared feasible, if it had not been for the digitizing projects that have made innumerable eighteenth and nineteenth century publications available in the public domain on such sites as [www.books.google.com](http://www.books.google.com) and [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org).

Without the financial support provided by the grant from the Danish Government (Bygnings- og Universitetsstyrelsen), and during the fourth year supplemented by the grant from the EUI, this project could never have been accomplished. The EUI has also funded my attendance at many conferences outside of its own venue. For these reasons alone, I am indebted to these institutions.

Ever since I can remember, I have always considered home the place where my books are. However, just like a cosy interior and a charming parlour, good books and the knowledge they contain are only worth little unless you have someone to share them with. The former may offer you shelter and the latter provide erudition, yet they would never be able to infuse you the bliss that only an excellent company can afford. Luckily, my Florentine sojourn has been blessed with the meeting of the best of friends; kindred spirits with whom I could always delight in the undiluted joy of serious academic discussion, playful debunking of each other's projects, as well as revelling in the more palatable charms of Tuscany. So here I want to avail myself of the opportunity to thank Alanna, Antoine, Jacob, Jannis, Lucas, Mats, Pablo, Thomas, and many more who, although not mentioned here, still compose an essential part of my fond memories of Florence and the EUI.

In this moment I also recall the memory of my parents who always encouraged me in doing what I yearned to do and who assisted me in embarking upon this voyage; even though they are not here to see me arrive at this desired destination, they are nonetheless always present in my mind and influential in everything that I do. Likewise, I owe a lot to my sister and probably severest critic, Maja Müller, whose insisting "but why" has always encouraged me to endeavour to improve my arguments and to become, if not a better person then at least a more amiable man!

And lastly, I want to express my deepest gratitude to Mariló whose mere presence has meant the world to me; whose indulgent attitude as well as her always well-timed – although every now and then rather annoying – insistence on either getting back to- or away from the books has helped me through the intellectual doldrums and moments of utter despair which writing a Ph.D. invariably entails. Far too often she has accepted to come second, and thus yielded her rightfully earned place in my life to the consuming burden of work, where she undeniably deserved to have been first, last, and everything. Mariló, I owe you more than you will ever know.



# Introduction.

“La imprecisión es tolerable o verosímil en la literatura, porque a ella propendemos siempre en la realidad. La simplificación conceptual de estados complejos es muchas veces una operación instantánea. El hecho mismo de percibir, de atender, es de orden selectivo: toda atención, toda fijación de nuestra conciencia, comporta con una deliberada omisión de lo no interesante. Vemos y oímos a través de recuerdos, de temores, de previsiones. ... Nuestro vivir es una serie de adaptaciones, vale decir, una educación del olvido.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Borges, J.L.: “La Postulación de la Realidad” (“The Postulation of Reality”, 1931) E. Allen, S.J. Levine, and E. Weinberger (“Jorge Luis Borges: The Total Library, Non-Fiction 1922-1986”, Penguin Books, 1999) give the following translation: “Imprecision is tolerable or plausible in literature because we almost always tend toward it in reality. The conceptual simplification of complex states is often an instantaneous operation. The very fact of perceiving, of paying attention, is selective; all attention, all focusing of our consciousness, involves a deliberate omission of what is not interesting. We see and hear through memories, fears, expectations. ... For us, living is a series of adaptations, which is to say, an education in oblivion.”



# 1. Fields, Scopes, Approaches, and Demarcations.

In summing up the wider colonial contexts of the prominent Victorian geologist and scientific organizer Sir Roderick Murchinson, R.A. Stafford concluded that:

“While the scientists won access to widening career options and new data, the imperial government gained accurate information for administering and developing its sprawling possessions. The commercial, industrial, and financial communities meanwhile received reliable reports of new products, markets, sources of supply, and investment opportunities both within and beyond the empire. The public at large gained for the first time an authentic, though culturally conditioned, vision of the diversity of environments and cultures into which their representatives were prying. Science also contributed to the emerging ideology of imperialism which justified rule over distant lands.”<sup>1</sup>

It was in such an environment that the Scottish scholar-administrator, diplomat, Orientalist, linguist, ethnologist, free trade ideologue, aspiring radical politician &c. John Crawford (1783-1868) moved, and to which he contributed considerably. Throughout more than half a century Crawford wrote extensively on almost all the above mentioned topics of imperial concern; he was, furthermore, profoundly implicated in many of the intellectual debates concerning which modes of approach and what analytical tools that provided the most authentic access to- and authoritative assessment of the ‘foreign’ societies both within- and on the fringes of the ever expanding British Empire. Although his position in some of these debates at times was rather marginal,<sup>2</sup> his contributions were never insignificant, nor did they then pass on unacknowledged by his peers, even if they today are condemned to oblivion or only attributed a subsidiary importance.<sup>3</sup>

This thematic versatility, combined with his productive longevity and his central position within some of the more prestigious *knowledge producing British colonial networks*, render Crawford’s textual production an informative point of departure for anyone who wants to inquire further into the dynamics of- as well as the debates within the interwoven fields of colonial knowledge and colonial enterprise during roughly the first half of the nineteenth century.

In terms of the contemporary intellectual attitudes towards the *colonial subjects*,<sup>4</sup> I fully concur with D. Amigoni who, although in a more restricted context, recently has stressed that: “in fact,

---

<sup>1</sup> Quotation from *Stafford*, p.189.

<sup>2</sup> See for instance C.M. Turnbull’s article on John Crawford in the ODNB.

<sup>3</sup> One of the rare exceptions to this pattern is to be encountered in *Ellingson* where it is contended that Crawford “would influence the thought and discourse of anthropology for a century and a half by his invention of the myth of the Noble Savage”. (p.xxi).

<sup>4</sup> Like Pels and Salemink I attach a triple sense to this term: 1) colonial *subjects* as referring to the colonial “detached observers” “who welded power to knowledge by claiming universality from the latter”, 2) “colonial subjects are the topoi of colonial discourse, the rhetorical commonplaces that organized the intellectual containment of the practical anxieties of colonial rule and became sufficiently entrenched in academic discourse to survive decolonization”, and 3) referring to “its ‘subject peoples’: the ‘races’, ‘tribes’, or ‘ethnic groups’”. (*Pels & Salemink*, p.3)

John Crawford *can be seen as an interesting barometer of shifting intellectual paradigms*; cited by both Darwin and Coleridge in the 1830s, Crawford ended his life in the late 1860s arguing against Darwin's theories".<sup>1</sup> This is an important point to stress: this dissertation does not aim at producing an exhaustive biographical research, nor do I necessarily aspire to include all the texts produced by Crawford in my investigation. Instead, Crawford's texts constitute the heuristic nexus and the narrative spinal cord of my research; my primary objects are to investigate the full content of these debates in which Crawford partook and to chart their epistemological and ideological contexts.<sup>2</sup>

## 1.1 Fields, Approaches, and Subject Areas.

The analytical focus in the reading of Crawford's texts and their ensuing contexts will be on the ways in which the notions of *civilization*, *race*, and *culture* were invoked, expressed, and embedded within the then prevalent intellectual and political *discourses*.<sup>3</sup> By considering these to be *keyconcepts*<sup>4</sup> in the contemporary debates regarding the authoritative modes of describing and defining the societies, which were either incorporated into the ever expanding British Empire or existing on its fringes, I endeavour to provide 1) an analysis of the intertwined diachronic dynamics between these concepts in the period ranging from the universal history of the Enlightenment to the anthropology of the mid-Victorian era, and 2) to chart the importance and discrepant meanings attributed to each of these concepts within the rival discourses contending for the interpretive and ideological hegemony throughout this period. Thence the analysis will also be directed towards an interest in the *evaluative-descriptive* qualities of the terms used to express these three keyconcepts.<sup>5</sup>

These concepts thus have to be assessed not only in their purely intellectual aspects, but also within their ideological, political, and colonial-administrative contexts. On the surface claiming to be primarily descriptive, they nonetheless possessed a normatively cogent dimension in terms of their inherent hierarchal and classificatory structures, as well as in providing a theoretical template for delineating the desired and/or *naturalized* past and future historical trajectories.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amigoni, p.27. My italics.

<sup>2</sup> On the problems and potentials of invoking *ideology* as an analytical category in this context, see Howe.

<sup>3</sup> There exist a vast field on *discourse theory* which I will not enter here; but as H. White has stated: "the discourse is intended to *constitute* the ground whereon to decide *what shall count as fact* in the matters under consideration and to determine *what mode of comprehension* is best suited to the understanding of the facts thus constituted" ... "As such, it is both interpretive and preinterpretive; it is always as much *about* the nature of interpretation itself as it is *about* the subject matter which is the manifest occasion of its own elaboration" (White 1978, pp.3-4; the italics are White's)

<sup>4</sup> R. Williams describes a *keyword* as: "I called these words *Keywords* in two connected senses: they are significant, binding words in certain activities and their interpretation; they are significant, indicative words in certain forms of thought." (p.15 in Williams 1983) *Key-concept* rather than *keyword* is chosen here to emphasize that the same *key-concept* may be articulated through different words.

<sup>5</sup> That is, "a concept which performs evaluative as well as descriptive functions in natural languages", and it emphasizes their ability "to perform one of two contrasting ranges of speech-acts. They are available, that is, to perform such acts as commending (and expressing and soliciting approval) or else of condemning (and expressing and soliciting disapproval) of any action or state of affairs they are used to describe" Skinner, Q: "Rhetoric and Conceptual Change", p.61 published in the Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought 3 (1999). Here quoted from p.8 in Bowden.



It has to be emphasized that the notions of *civilization*, *race*, and *culture* here must be perceived as *analytical tools*, and they should not be conflated with the kindred terms expressed in the contemporary discourses. During the period analysed here, *terms* such as civilization, nation, race, tribe, culture, etc. did not refer to a set of fixed concepts, but, on the contrary, they were often overlapping and ascribed only very loose meanings; the very same term could thus refer to widely divergent phenomena, entities, or scales even within the same sentence.<sup>1</sup> The shifts in the rhetorical invocations and categorical distinctions between these terms and the growing rigidification of the concepts referred to by these will actually constitute core research areas in this dissertation. The historical discourses analysed through these three keyconcepts should not be perceived as isolated from one another; rather, they were often intricately interwoven and at times dialectically opposed in the various colonial discourses. They were primarily articulated within the broader fields of history, conjectural history, and ethnology; they comprised methodologies and arguments extracted from the practices of philology, antiquarianism, linguistics, political economy, natural history, etc.

With *civilization* I mainly tend to address the universalizing tendencies to perceive the history of mankind in its totality and to inscribe its (unilinear) trajectory within some kind of stadial and generally progressionist scheme<sup>2</sup>. *Race* refers specifically to the more segregationist approaches that stressed difference over unity and were characterized by practising the discursive process of ‘othering’ through a demarcation of assumed absolute and essential differences of some kind or another; during this period the focus came to be increasingly on the biological differences existing between the various societies, and these were primarily identified in terms of bodily differences which allegedly possessed much wider implications in terms of actual capabilities or human potential. As an analytical tool, *culture* here represents the more individuating scope, the strategies that stress the particular features of each society, and which especially found their expression in the burgeoning historical discipline that was closely affiliated with the ‘birth and growth’ of the idea of the nation state.

Moving in the epistemological hyperspace between *term*, *concept*, and *contextualized meaning* it is obviously of vital importance to determine the links and connections between these. Yet it seems to me that any such enterprise defies the invariable reductionism ingrained in all kinds of mechanically operationalized modes of procedure grounded in a too rigorous and unplastic methodology; especially if it has to take due account of the notorious terminological inconsistency (especially in ‘non-scientific’ and politicised discourses), the protean malleability of the concepts, and the innate instability associated with any kind of contextualization. Hence, I concur with H.

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. pp.191-192 in *Trautmann 1997/2004*, and p.89 in *Thomas*.

<sup>2</sup> As opposed to for instance the Biblical-genealogical framework which, although of a universal scope too, most often ascribed to the trope of degeneration; there were also many schemes which were in various ways composed of both.

Aarsleff's statement that "terminology is useful but also risky, for it does not always indicate what is often hastily assumed to say. It must be treated against conceptualization." Indeed, we as historians are perhaps prone to feel "more comfortable with the philological evidence of citation than with the more telling testimony of conceptualization", even if we recognize that in such researches as mine the most important is to "grasp the overall structure of arguments and conceptualization, even in the absence of terminological expression."<sup>1</sup> Other analytical tools are also required when examining the colonial contexts of the knowledge production, its explanative strategies, and the kinds of evidence employed. Amongst these the notions of *investigative modalities* and of *levels of knowledge* deserve particular attention.<sup>2</sup>

## 1.2 Spatio-Temporal Demarcations.

Temporally, Crawford published in a period that spanned from 1814 to 1869. This offers us a unique opportunity to trace both the glaring and the more invisible, but not necessarily less insignificant, changes that the scientific and historical discourses underwent during this era in which the content and shapes of the colonial enterprise also changed drastically.

In terms of space, this dissertation will encompass both the metropolis (Great Britain) and the colonial peripheries where Crawford resided, i.e. especially India and Southeast Asia; these latter two geographical units were then much closer connected on both a personal, institutional, and conceptual level than often it is often appreciated today, and this can be demonstrated by Crawford's career and writings. Both regions were integrated in the idea, or concept, of 'India'.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, constituting and defining these (potentially) colonial spaces composed an integrated and important part of the colonial knowledge production and of the intellectual debates it generated.<sup>4</sup>

Rather than assuming a fixed and immutable divide between the *metropolis* and the *colonial peripheries* the present dissertation focus on the knowledge orientated networks, more often than not transcending the artificial boundaries between metropolis and periphery. With this I do not wish to suggest that the location of the knowledge production and its subsequent distribution was irrelevant; however, nor can we "reduce colonial knowledge to being an instrument deployed at will to protect and maintain imperial authority. Neither the painless transplantation of metropolitan ideology nor the uncontested imposition of administrative exigency, colonial knowledge must be

---

<sup>1</sup> All these quotes are from Aarsleff 1982, pp.20-21. Hence my prioritization of an attention towards *keyconcepts* rather than *keywords*, given that the former can be present without the latter; the heuristic challenge then is, of course, bigger when having to identify such, and they will always invariably rely on the ability of the historian's interpretation to convince the readers rather than on the easier identifiable, manifestly present textual evidence.

<sup>2</sup> These concepts have been discussed in Cohn 1996, and in Bayly 1996 respectively.

<sup>3</sup> See Trautmann 2009a, especially the essay entitled "Finding India's Place: Locational Projects of the Longue Durée", pp.155-188. On the concept of a "greater" India, see Rendall, p.44; Kerijawal, pp.119-122, and Edney, pp.3-9.

<sup>4</sup> This topic has recently been touched upon in a Southeast Asian setting by Douglas & Ballard.

seen as the product of complex local engagements, struggles over meaning and power enacted within the unequal power relations of colonialism”.<sup>1</sup> And this goes for the ‘native’ contributions as well as for the British overseas communities too.<sup>2</sup> In order to fully appreciate the polyglot and hybrid character of the colonial knowledge production we need to get beyond such binaries as metropolis→←periphery, ‘native’→←‘British’, and ‘knowledge producers’→← ‘information gatherers’, without, however, losing sight of the queries originally posed through these categorical approaches. This has especially been the focus of much recent work on the entangled multi-directionality of the *networked nature of colonial knowledge production*<sup>3</sup> and the relationality and importance of spatial location in the production, transmission, and reception of knowledge.<sup>4</sup>

### 1.3 Hypotheses.

Based on the research fields and questions carved out above, I pose the following hypotheses:

- The ideas of civilization, race, and culture/history were instrumental in John Crawford’s and his contemporaries’ approach to- and conceptualization of the colonial subjects and the societies on the fringes of the empire. The controversial questions regarding the identity of- and the future trajectories cut out for these spaces and the societies inhabiting them were primarily addressed through a discursive struggle over the authoritative definitions and the adequate applicability of these ideas. This provided a common epistemological ground for the different, yet entwined discourses that were concerned 1) with allegedly pure knowledge production, 2) with the ideological dimensions, and 3) with the actual policy making as well as its implementation.
- Through the prism of Crawford’s writings we can obtain a multifaceted gleam of some of the fundamental aspects involved in the colonial knowledge production and implementation, as well as its ideological dimensions, during what C.A. Bayly has termed the “proconsular, aristocratic militarism” of the ‘Imperial Meridian’ (1780-1830),<sup>5</sup> into the ideologically tumultuous 1830s,<sup>6</sup> and through to the subsequent ideological consolidation in the Victorian era.
- These dynamics roughly correlated with a parallel, and unquestionably closely linked, shift in the hegemonic knowledge paradigms from 1) the two linguistically orientated, but otherwise

<sup>1</sup> Ballantyne 2002, p.192.

<sup>2</sup> Trautmann 2009a, p.111 (in the essay “Hullabaloo about Telugu” (org. 1999)), pp.93-111, p.111.

<sup>3</sup> The literature on this topic is vast and steadily growing; but see e.g.: Ballantyne, 2001, and Ballantyne 2002; Lester 2001, and Lester 2006; Lambert & Lester; Raj; Delburgo; Hillemann; Schaffer, Roberts, Raj, & Delburgo; Magee & Thompson; and Bennett & Hodge. See also the special issues dedicated to the global history of science in *Itinerario* in 2009 (Vol.33:1, “Science and Global History, 1750-1850”), and in *Isis* in 2010 (Vol.101:1, “Focus: Global Histories of Science”).

<sup>4</sup> These fields have in this context in particular been cultivated by D.N. Livingstone and C.W.J. Withers; see e.g. Livingstone 2003; Livingstone 2005; Livingstone 2007; Withers 2007; Withers 2009; and Livingstone & Withers 2011.

<sup>5</sup> Bayly 1989.

<sup>6</sup> The classical work here is Stokes. See also e.g. Sen; Metha; Hall 2002; Mariott; Pitts 2005; and Koditschek 2011.

oppositional, strands of Orientalistic philology and Scottish conjectural history<sup>1</sup> towards 2) a biologically determined racial, and often overt racist, approach at the end of this period.

## **2. From Theory to Methodology.**

### **2.1 Texts and Contexts**

Crawfurd did not produce his texts in isolation from other texts or from other influences. In this dissertation it is my intention to analyse the source-material produced by Crawfurd through an examination of the material- and the discursive contexts in which these sources were embedded, to which they in some way referred to, and to the framing and dynamic of which they contributed actively and often in quite significant ways. The challenge posed here consists of determining *what* is meant by context, *how* can the existence of such contexts be “proved”, or at least made to appear convincing, and *how* can these “contextual texts” be identified.

In delineating these contexts I think it will necessary both to include what might be termed as the *direct links* and the vaguer and more elusive, but nonetheless influential, *referential frameworks* in the shape of shared ideas and representational practices.

With *direct links* I mean: a) intertextual connections such as quotations, explicit references to other writings, as well as the more veiled, and sometimes even unintentional, references and allusions either present in Crawfurd’s texts, or which in other texts referred to him and his textual production; and b) the chains of correspondence in which these texts partook, or, more importantly, the scientific, political, or personal debates to which they explicitly contributed.

The *referential frameworks* are composed of the commonly accepted, and continuously invoked discourse-formations which at least to some degree reflected a shared sphere of ideas or notions. In order to render such a referential framework probable and relevant it is, as Umberto eco has stressed in another context, “not necessary to document the direct links, but rather to demonstrate the existence of an intellectual climate in which ideas could circulate and within which a formal and informal debate ... might ensue”.<sup>2</sup> This intellectual climate, based a shared referential framework, would often be reflected discursively through a use of certain keyconcepts and *tropes* – such as, for instance, civilization, race, culture, progression, and degeneration – notwithstanding whether the use of these were based on a commonly accepted consensus, or whether the definitorial hegemony of these was contended and subjected to debate. Furthermore, when belonging to the same referential framework, this would often result in the articulation of a set of commonly accepted

---

<sup>1</sup> Which also, incidentally, correspond to what in *Trautmann 1997/2004* had been denominated ‘indomania’ and ‘indophobia’.

<sup>2</sup> “Eco”, p.51.

*topoi* that were used in rather uniform and often authoritative ways, and which thus were potentially vested with both descriptive and normative implications.<sup>1</sup>

By analysing Crawford's texts through the intellectual and political debates to which they contributed, further light can be shed both on their content and, more importantly, on their importance within, as well as for these. Sometimes it can, however, be beneficial to elucidate Crawford's texts and their representative value by inscribing them into to an even more broadly defined referential framework; this approach can provide elucidations on the distribution of the *burden of explanation*, the applied *types* and *modes of argumentation*, etc. used in Crawford et al's texts. This may also abet in explaining how, for instance, Crawford's discourses were profoundly influenced by the tenets of Scottish conjectural history, even though he hardly ever referred to any of its foundational texts or to any of the philosophers and historians who authored these. That is, such broader referential frameworks provides a rationale explaining why explicit absences of any references to a specific text in a given discourse sometimes has to be interpreted as cogent, albeit implicit, evidence of how this text actually permeated the discourse in question.

## 2.2 Interpretive Frameworks, Strategies of Reading, and Hermeneutic Scales.

In order to examine both the specificities and the interrelations between the different levels of knowledge and the diverging epistemological modalities, my readings of the source-material include four integrated, yet still distinct, analytical levels which, in conjunction, embrace all my main subject areas. These analytical levels should, however, not be perceived as analytically exhaustive;<sup>2</sup> rather they merely represent a pragmatic attempt to structure my approaches and reflections in a coherent and consistent manner and, at the same time, do justice to the "nature" of the sources. For the historian the sources must always come first, and, although the sources evidently cannot tell anything until being interrogated intelligently, one should beware of not turning the methodology into a Procrustean bed that ultimately distorts the original meanings, intentions, and receptions of these sources.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Tropes* are here defined as a rather *formalistic* trait of the given discourse, and as such an identified similarity in the used tropes do not necessarily imply a common discourse formation or a shared referential framework; discourses widely disconnected in both time and space may apply similar tropes in their descriptions of the world, and hence share some common features without, however, exhibiting any signs of shared origin (*stemma*). By *topoi*, on the other hand, I here refer to verbal figures or expressions that exhibit a purely contingent congruence in both their expression *and* in their content, and thence invoking the same *topoi* do suggest some kind of intertextual relatedness, or at least a shared referential framework. Or, in other words, two texts invoking the same *topoi* seem to partake in the same, however loosely knit, discourse formation. Using *topoi* to identify a common discourse formation, or a shared referential framework, however poses the heuristic challenge of rendering it probable that the identified similarities on the expressional side of the apparently same *topoi* in different texts actually also reflect a shared congruency in the content as well; that is, that these similar expressions actually can be taken as being the same *topoi*, and that these indicate a common discourse formation or a shared referential framework.

<sup>2</sup> Thus I do not pretend to introduce an approach that addresses the past society in its 'totality', like some kind of Althusserian multi-tiered structuralist approach; my methodological aspirations are certainly more modest, and my methodology has thus been conceived in a tight hermeneutic relationship with the content and form of the my sources.

Therefore all four levels will not necessarily be applied to each of the issues and themes that I analyse throughout my research.

**2.2.1 Reading for the Rationale:** This approach is carried out within an overall strategy of *reading for the rationale* and it focuses on the structural cohesion of the epistemic foundations and philosophical theories which infused the texts, even though they might not be explicitly present. What is intended here is a *synchronic* approach that analyses the epistemological and conceptual rationale behind the actual theories articulated in the texts, and which attributed meaning, relevancy, and authority to these texts. The dangers ingrained in such an approach are: 1) the risk of producing a too static and uniform representation of the past that does not sufficiently account for neither change nor dissent; 2) when you read for a rationale you will probably find it too – even where it might appear quite far-fetched. The risk is to ignore or misinterpret discursive fissures as well as internal and external discrepancies in the texts. This will, however, be addressed in the following.

**2.2.2 Contested Discursive Fields:** This level of analysis focuses on the actual debates and on the contested tropes or concepts; it stresses the *diachronic* aspects and the dynamic features of the discourses. Instead of assuming that the analysed texts (source-material) constitute one coherent and consistent discourse, they are here instead perceived as composing different, and to a certain extent antagonistic, (sub)discourses competing within the same discursive formation for expressing the most authoritative mode of representation. Topics to be dealt with here include: 1) the distribution of the *burden of proof* in the argumentation; i.e. what was deemed in need of an explanation, and what was accepted without any further argumentation as representing the *natural* state of affairs. 2) The *modes and types of arguments*; i.e. what kind of arguments (referring to the more formalistic aspect) and knowledge (referring to the actual content) were perceived as providing an *authentic* representation of the history and the societies in question; and how did they determine the problem of authenticity. The former aspect includes an attention on whether they applied a positive or a negative mode of argumentation, whether a field was defined through identity or alterity, what kinds of analogical reasoning were deemed authoritative and employed, etc. 3) What were the *inter-argumentative criteria* for validity; that is, what intertextual and rhetorical strategies were pleaded in order to constitute the *authority* of the text's allegedly authentic representations.

**2.2.3 'Genres' and the Shaping of Knowledge:**<sup>1</sup> The purpose is here to study the discrepancies in the content, articulations, and intertextual relationships between the different colonial genres;

---

<sup>1</sup> The term *genre* should here be interpreted in its loosest, non-essentialist, non-presentist, and non-specialized meaning: i.e. as just referring to a loosely-knit set of texts that in the past social world was considered as possessing some common features in their form and/or content. These texts were then perceived as having similar qualities and hence subjected to roughly the same standards in terms of reception and evaluation. Probably this influenced their production too, both in terms of what to include and what to exclude from the published text as well as how to present the content. For a thoughtful discussion of the problems with 'genre' in historical research, see *Adams 1983*, chapter 1.

what I intend here is thus to examine both the textual criteria associated with the different genres and the ways in which these, in each their own manner, interacted with the social praxis. How, and to what extent, did the genre in which the knowledge was articulated determine the content through its form, and how did this influence the “social impact” of the text? Also *within* each genre these questions are worth considering, e.g. in travel literature. Thus I concur with C.B. Brettell when she stressed that: “the form of the account itself – a guidebook, an itinerary for those on the grand tour, a journal, a narrative, a series of letters to a real or fictional person back home – is clearly an important consideration in any attempt to evaluate the observations it contains”, and “it is certainly worth considering differences in the reception of travel narratives in any analysis and evaluation of the various accounts which are lumped together in the travel literature category”.<sup>1</sup>

**2.2.4 Making the Text Matter:** Crucial to this analytical level is: 1) an examination of the relationship between the preconceived notions of the described people and places and the implications of these preconceptions upon the empirical observations and actual analyses (i.e. confirming, rejecting, or adjusting and elaborating on these preconceptions). 2) How did this influence both the ideologies and the political stances towards the indigenous rulers and societies, when having to deal with these; that is, how did it relate to- and how did it affect the colonial praxis. 3) Simultaneously one has to be aware of how the confrontation with the “real phenomena of the world” impressed itself upon the analytical gaze in different manners depending on the mode of the encounter; here the focus will be on the composition of the social field which invariably will always *epistemologically precede* the actual process of (re)cognition. The spatio-temporal constellations of this social sphere precondition *what* part of the social reality that is considered relevant, or indeed necessary, to be cognitively processed and articulated. An examination of this aspect might also throw light on *why* this particular part of the social space was considered indispensable to know.

## **2.3 The Past in the Present and the Present in the Past: the Historian’s Tools.**

Practicing any kind of historical research obviously involves a set of considerations on how to accommodate the past in the present, and on how to construe a discourse that at the same ‘time’ incorporates both the manifold historical voices and that of the historian herself into one consistent whole, whilst simultaneously managing to distinguish manifestly between these two dimensions. It is only through such a deliberate discursive distinction that *History* originates as an epistemological gaze and a specific way to approach the contemporary phenomena which are here being perceived as imbued with historical meaning (whether as a text, an artefact, or something else). The essential ‘heterology’ inherent in any historical discourse assumes a priori, as stressed by M. de Certeau, “a

---

<sup>1</sup> P.132 in *Brettell*.

gap to exist between the silent opacity of the ‘reality’ that it seeks to express and the place where it produces its own speech, protected by the distance established between itself and its object (Gegenstand).”<sup>1</sup> With a special focus on the historiography of anthropology, G.W. Stocking elaborated further on this when he pointed to how “historical understanding presupposes a continuing tension between past and present – not only a historian’s present and the past he studies, but that past present and its antecedent past, and between that same past present and all its consequent futures – among which our own present is, if only for the moment, the most important.”<sup>2</sup>

The historian’s craft is evidently permeated by past practices, but it is also too often (mis)guided by a deeply rooted tendency to privilege present queries to such a degree that they facilitate an inherently teleological narrative where the past is purely assessed in terms of how it seamlessly led to the present state of affairs. This “inevitably leads to harnessing evidence of one’s sources into a history that is nothing more than the ineluctable passage of the past into the necessary forms of the present.”<sup>3</sup> Whereas such an approach is doubtlessly capable of producing a neat narrative, this can nonetheless only be achieved at the expense of a reductionist downplaying of the past’s complexities, confusions, and convoluted trails; these shaped the world views and the hermeneutic horizons of the historical actors, and hence influenced their capability for thinking and their capacity of acting, just as profoundly as the (retrospectively constructed) shining path that led to what the future present would some day see as its own manifestation!

As antidote to such an innately triumphalist tenor, P. Chatterjee, has recently advocated the adoption of an awareness of “the irreducible contingency of historical events that can never be fully encompassed by conceptual abstractions” when studying “the history of empire as a global practice of power”; such a methodological quest will also invariably point “toward the significance of the historical tendencies that never fructified, or developments that were arrested or suppressed.”<sup>4</sup> I think that it makes much sense within this context then to let Crawford’s textual production constitute the narrative spinal cord and the structuring principle in this dissertation. Perhaps more often than not Crawford, as we will see, seemed to be emblematic of such theoretical queries and approaches that might have been widely disseminated in their own day, but which did not stand the test of time and hence often were written out of the Whiggish historiography. Approaching the colonial debates on the significance, meaning, and implications of the notions of civilization, race,

---

<sup>1</sup> From his essay on “Writings and Histories”; quoted in *Certeau & Ward*, p.24. (The essay runs from p.23 to p.36)

<sup>2</sup> Stocking 1987, p.xv. De Certeau would, in a more general context, make a similar claim in the abovementioned essay.

<sup>3</sup> *Chatterjee* 2012, p.xii.

<sup>4</sup> All these three quotations are from *Chatterjee* 2012, p.xii.



and history from a point of departure in Crawford's textual production can thus be an adequate way to re-historicise<sup>1</sup> these debates and purvey a 'new' interpretive angle.

G.W. Stocking has ever since the 1960s written extensively on how the historiography of anthropology for a long time had been guided by such a presentist tendency. That is, a mode of procedure where the (Whig) historian "seeks out in the past phenomena which seem to resemble those of concern in the present, and then moves forward in time by tracing lineages up to the present in simple sequential movement."<sup>2</sup> Such a wrenching of "the individual historical phenomenon from the complex network of its contemporary context" renders it "prone to anachronistic misinterpretation."<sup>3</sup> Instead, I will endeavour to follow Stocking when he advocated an approach that focussed as much on "the history of men thinking" as "the history of thought",<sup>4</sup> and which intended "to see historical change as a complex process of emergence rather than a simple linear sequence – in short to understand the science of a given period in its own terms."<sup>5</sup> I will do this whilst simultaneously recognizing that the standpoint of the historian is always invariably in the presence, both in terms of purpose, relevancy, and conceptual framework.

These problems are particularly acute when studying the history of men thinking historically, notwithstanding whether this historical thinking was of a more general nature, or whether it was conducted within more specified branches of knowledge, such as the one examined by Stocking. In such cases, as in this present study too, the connections between the historical discourse and that of the present historian become further muddled; not only due to the fact that the historical- and the historiographical discourses share the same basic terminology, but particularly because the concepts invoked by these terminologies in the latter case are often saturated with undigested reminiscences of the conceptual tensions and still ongoing power struggles that were generated in the former.<sup>6</sup> When studying the history of men thinking – *what* they thought, as well as *how* and *why* they thought it – it thus becomes more necessary than ever to distinguish clearly between: 1) the ambiguous uses of such terms as civilization, race, and culture within the *historical discourses* that I here first reproduce and then subject to examination; and 2) the more stringent use of the terms when they are applied as *analytical tools* within my own historiographical discourse.

As J.G.A. Pocock has written:

---

<sup>1</sup> A process which is not devoid of its own problems though. I thus tend to concur with G.W. Stocking when he wrote: "But like everything historical, 'historicism' is a relative concept. In schematizing long ranges of intellectual history to provide background for the questions asked by Victorian anthropologists [or, as in my case, by Crawford and his contemporaries], we may have wrenched the thinking of their predecessors loose from the context of *their* questioning." (Stocking 1987, p.285. Stocking's italics)

<sup>2</sup> From "On the Limits of 'Presentism' and Historicism in the Historiography of the Behavioral Sciences" (org. 1965), quoted from Stocking 1982, pp.3-4

<sup>3</sup> Stocking 1982, p.4.

<sup>4</sup> Stocking 1982, p.5.

<sup>5</sup> Stocking 1982, p.8.

<sup>6</sup> See Stocking 1987, p.xv.

“This historian is in considerable measure an archaeologist; he is engaged in uncovering the presence of various language contexts in which discourse has from time to time been conducted.”

And:

“The historian learns a language in order to read it, not to write it. His own writings will not be composed of pastiches of the various languages he has learned,..., but of languages of interpretation, which he has developed and learnt to write, each designed to bring out and articulate, in a kind of paraphrase, the assumptions, intimations, etc., explicit and implicit in one or more of the languages he has learnt to read.... This leaves room for both critical and historical detachment; the historian’s language contains his resources for affirming both that he is adequately interpreting another’s *parole* and that this *parole* was in fact being conducted in the *langue*, or in the selection and combination of *langues*, to which the historian has assigned it.”<sup>1</sup>

It is exactly in this hermeneutic limbo, lingering somewhere between contemporary analysis and past practices that the historical discourse is concocted and materialised; that is, when the historical is being (re)presented and vested with meanings that are directed at present readers.

### **3. Historiography.**

As mentioned, the central argument in this dissertation is pending on an analytical tripod, focussing on the dynamics of the interchangeable meanings, uses, and contexts of the keyconcepts of *civilization*, *culture/history*, and *race* within the British and colonial realms. Such an approach invariably places the research project in an intersectional space between several well established *historiographical fields*, and this obviously affects the historiographical traditions upon which I rely, as well as the ongoing debates in which this project will be situated.<sup>2</sup>

This implies that I in the following will have to address several of the most important of these, and, given the limited space accorded to this here, it necessarily has to be executed in a suggestive rather than in an exhaustive manner; however, I hope that the accompanying references and notes might convey some idea of the conceptual complexities and ideological intricacies involved in these historiographies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pocock 1987, pp.23 & 27.

<sup>2</sup> However, I have here, in the name of maintaining a reasonable brevity, omitted discussions of such important questions as: 1) the composition and dynamics of the colonial knowledge networks; 2) the question regarding the importance and composition of ‘Indigenous knowledge’ and ‘agency’; 3) the connections between travel literature and empire; 4) the emerging theories (as well as the realities!) of environmentalism, the notion of spatiality, and the carving out of different colonial spaces; 5) and not at least the ways in which knowledge on the past of own and foreign societies was obtained and articulated – that is, what methodologies were applied in these processes, to what theories did this lead, and into which larger referential frameworks were it all inscribed. Instead I will endeavour to discuss these issues whenever they arise within my analysis.

The changes in application contexts and in attributed meanings of the idea of civilization from the framework of the Scottish conjectural history to the burgeoning sciences of ethnology and anthropology in the mid-Victorian Era will constitute an analytical focal point throughout the whole dissertation. This field has been most thoroughly covered by the now classic texts by J. Burrow and G.W. Stocking from different, and somewhat opposing, angles:<sup>1</sup> whereas Burrow had claimed that radical changes happened in these fields during the 1830s, and that a by now obsolete conjectural history was substituted by other forms of inquiry, Stocking, in explicit opposition to this thesis, stressed the importance of the "longer-run historical forces that sustained a concern with the relationship of civilization and savagism".<sup>2</sup> Whereas I do not aspire to provide any definitive answer of this problem, I nonetheless endeavour to chart meticulously the contours- and to sound the profundity of the ruptures as well as the continuities in the definitions and uses of the idea of civilization, as it was manifested through Crawford's contributions; in fact, as we will see, he embodied both of these aspects of change and continuity to a remarkable extent.<sup>3</sup>

The wider cultural context of the rising of anthropology as a science has been dealt with from both a cultural angle and from the sphere of political thought; from the former approach both G. Beer and more recently D. Amigoni have seen Crawford as a central figure in some of the important debates on these matters raging in the pre-Victorian and Victorian periods.<sup>4</sup> "That Noble Science of Politics" by J. Burrow, D. Winch, and S. Collini still provides a broad and profound sketch of the philosophical foundations for- and the intellectual environment associated with British politics during a good part of the 19<sup>th</sup> C,<sup>5</sup> whereas both e.g. J. Majeed, U.S. Metha, and J. Pitts have addressed some of the same questions within the context of the influence of radical and utilitarian thinking on the Indian possessions.<sup>6</sup>

The vast number of texts dealing with Orientalistic topics which have been inspired by E. Said's approaches and produced within the realms of literary and cultural criticism also invariably touches upon some of the same topics; yet, given the vastness of the field and the rather marginal affiliation with the project here delineated, I will abstain from commenting any further upon this here.

Within the historiography of the empire the question of race has at times been defined so broadly that it encompasses virtually all hierarchal or pejorative discourses on foreign societies; as such it is presumed to possess an all-embracing influence upon the colonial knowledge production and the discursive procedures into which these were inscribed. Analytically, such a crude conceptual

---

<sup>1</sup> Burrow 1966 and Stocking 1987.

<sup>2</sup> Stocking 1987. p.xiii.

<sup>3</sup> Both Burrow and Stocking included Crawford in their texts, but only as a rather marginal figure.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Amigoni and Beer..

<sup>5</sup> Collini, Winch, & Burrow.

<sup>6</sup> See Majeed 1990, and Majeed 1992, Metha 1997, Metha 1999, as well as Pitts 2005.

approach tends to conflate all colonial discourses, and hence many epistemological complexities and internal ideological fissures are overlooked; this often leads to an all too reductionist linking between the discourse and social praxis. As emphasised by N. Thomas, “race is not the only basis for representing others or representing them negatively”.<sup>1</sup> In the Anglo-Saxon case this point has been convincingly argued by C. Kidd who has stressed that the Christian – later followed by religiously derived scientific – discourses provided the authoritative referential frameworks within the major British cultural and scientific discourses on these matters at least until the advent of the controversies spurred by Darwinism during the 1860s.<sup>2</sup> Before then, the staunchly materialistic, racial theories only occupied a marginal position; this was the case with, for instance, the notorious racial universal history of R. Knox as well as with Nott and Gliddon’s racist texts, although these has retrospectively received an unduly large attention from historians, cultural theorists, etc..

The stronger secularist trends in France facilitated another path for the development of the racial theories there; this has recently been argued in a work by B. Douglas and C. Ballard which, apart from providing a general analysis of the various European racial theories throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> C., also maps the differences in their impact upon both the French and the British discourses (incl. Crawford’s) on the native societies inhabiting Southeast Asia and Oceania.<sup>3</sup> This has also formed the main theme of M. Staum’s book on these topics published a few years ago.<sup>4</sup>

In time it has almost become a commonplace to present the newer historiography on the conditions of the British knowledge production in 19<sup>th</sup> C. India within the framework of the methodological and epistemological divide expressed by the publication of B.S. Cohn’s “Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge” and C. Bayly’s “Empire and Information: Intelligence gathering and social communication in India, 1780-1870”, both published in 1996.<sup>5</sup> In each their way these books epitomize the two dominant strands of research in this field – viz. the approach founded in English social history, stressing the aspects of continuity and collaboration and known as the ‘Cambridge School’<sup>6</sup> on the one hand, as opposed to the emphasis on a radical rupture and subsequent conceptual conquest caused the British colonization of India, such as this was articulated by many postmodernists, especially within American academia and by some members of the so-called ‘Subaltern school’. This clear distinction has served its heuristic purposes well, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas 1994, p.53.

<sup>2</sup> Kidd 2006; this central argument was an elaboration of one originally posed in Livingstone 1992b. Kidd did not claim that this obviated any racist connotations, but only that these were not solely based on biological speculations; for more on this, see also Brantlinger 2003.

<sup>3</sup> See Douglas & Ballard.

<sup>4</sup> Staum.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Pinch, Ballantyne 2001, and Ballantyne 2008.

<sup>6</sup> For an analysis of the fundamental assumptions and approaches of this see e.g. pp.253-254 in Wilson; and Howe, p.165. This is not to be confused with the ‘Cambridge School’ within intellectual history and usually associated with the likes of Q. Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock.

has a lot to recommend it; yet it cannot contain all the research done in this vast field. Thus, for instance, will it not be altogether that easy to posit T.R. Trautmann's insistence on "how some aspects of coloniality [and in particular colonial knowledge production] only become visible through comparison and *in the light of a longer historical view*"<sup>1</sup> within this framework. Apart from an ongoing publication of insightful articles,<sup>2</sup> Trautmann is most renowned for his "Aryans and British India" (1997) and "Languages & Nations: The Dravidian Proof in Colonial Madras" (2006). In addition to his insistence on the importance of assessing the colonial encounter and its knowledge production within a *longue durée* framework, Trautmann has also consistently focussed on the interaction between Indian intellectuals and British scholar-administrators involved in the colonial knowledge production; despite a "structural asymmetry" inherent in these processes, Trautmann has emphasized that "the tendency to overestimate colonial power and underestimate Indian knowledge"<sup>3</sup> in the study of knowledge-formation in British India is a fault that we should strive to overcome."<sup>4</sup> Besides, he has also pleaded for an enhanced attention towards the specificity of the local contexts in which the knowledge production in colonial India took place, and on how this influenced the modes, content, and directions of the knowledge production.<sup>5</sup> Although the direct impact of Trautmann's studies upon this dissertation is perhaps only slight, the insights provided by his meticulous studies and the new fields of research he has opened have nonetheless influenced my approach as well as my choice of fields of research profoundly; this is especially the case in his studies on the intersections between (both European and Indian) philology and ethnology on the one hand and applied colonial knowledge on the other.

Of particular interesting for my dissertation is also the research done in the recent years on what might termed 'the Scottish School on Indian Governance' and its accompanying knowledge production.<sup>6</sup> The idea of civilization played a particular important role in the Scottish theories on

---

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann 2009a, p.109, (org. 1999) my italics. Analysing the "linguistic projects" in especially colonial Southern India, Trautmann pointed out that in "this level of [European] scholarly engagement with India, colonialism acts as a kind of technology, giving scope to the colonizer's will, for the execution of programs that have been formed prior to colonization, in this case, very long previous". Similarly, it would also be difficult to place e.g. M. Adas's synthesis on the parallel and overlapping trajectories of technology and ideology within a very narrow context of the expanding European Colonial world. (in Adas)

<sup>2</sup> A selection of these can be found in Trautmann 2009a; he has also edited, and contributed with important articles to-, Trautmann 2005, and Trautmann 2009b.

<sup>3</sup> For a collection of recent surveys of the forms and content of South Asian knowledge production prior to the colonial period, see Pollock 2011.

<sup>4</sup> Trautmann 2009b, pp.11-12.

<sup>5</sup> Trautmann has thus throughout both his books and his articles cogently argued for the existence two, quite different, 'schools' of oriental research situated in Calcutta and Madras respectively. Trautmann 1997/2004 was primarily dedicated to the former, whereas Trautmann 2006 exclusively dealt with the latter; see also Trautmann 2009b, pp.1-25. The articles contained in Talbot intend to follow in Trautmann's trail and to continue his strand of research.

<sup>6</sup> The classic work on this is J. Rendall's article from 1982. (Rendall) M. McLaren has produced the most detailed analyses on this subject; see e.g. McLaren 1993, and McLaren 2001. Recently A.A. Powell has published a study on the Muir brothers' slightly later knowledge production on especially northern India, which is here assessed within a framework of a specific brand of *Scottish Orientalism*. (Powell) Neither Macfie (pp.175-179) nor Koditschek 2011

imperial governance, and as such the research done in this field shares many features in common with the more general studies of the intertwined notions of civilization and empire – whether concentrating on the liberal and utilitarian ideas and their implantation in the 19<sup>th</sup> C., as Stokes, Pitts, and Metha do,<sup>1</sup> or whether the imperial dimension of the idea of civilization is assessed within a temporally much longer and spatially broader scope of empire generally, such as recently practised by e.g. A. Pagden, D. Armitage, B. Mazlish, and most recently in B. Bowden’s study of the intertwined nature of the notions of *civilization* and *empire*, both in theoretical thinking and in implemented practice.<sup>2</sup> These trends of research can, perhaps, all be inscribed under the general heading of liberal imperialism; a topic which – apparently with clear references to contemporary events – seemed to attract much attention throughout the 2000s. In a review article on the recent historiography dealing with the British empire and its liberal mission, A. Sartori advanced (from a Marxian infused point of view) a fundamental critique most of this literature; with its predominantly discursive and theory-orientated analyses this failed, according to Sartori, to take serious account of the socio-historical constitution in which these liberal-imperial ideas were coined, articulated, consumed, and implemented. Sartori argued that they, in contrast, often seemed to ascribe context a more ornamental than actual importance in their argumentation.<sup>3</sup> Instead, Sartori advocated an approach where the constitutive function of context upon both the form and foundational content of the discourse(s) was stressed; this could be achieved by grasping “liberal discourse as a set of subjective categories embedded within certain constitutive social practices, then we have a much broader canvas of social transformation and imperial practice on which to paint the history of liberalism’s global dissemination, without having to give up the crucial role played by the British Empire as an (ambivalent) institutional vehicle of the global dissemination of liberal discourse”.<sup>4</sup> One of the most recent offshoots of this approach, criticised by Sartori, is T. Koditschek’s “liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain”. The author here examined the ways in which the 19<sup>th</sup> C. British historical writing – in its explanative modes, choices of themes, delineated historical trajectories, etc. – both mirrored and actively abetted in transforming the shifting imperial agendas, right from the onset of the second empire (1783) and throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> C.. Or, as he summed up, when presenting the core of his argument which also, *mutatis mutandis*, is applicable as a fundamental premise for this dissertation:

---

(pp.66-71) add much new to what have especially been said by Rendall; Koditschek, however, do provide some new interpretations on Malcolm’s and Elphinstone’s work. (pp.71-90)

<sup>1</sup> See Stokes, Metha 1997, Metha 1999, and Pitts 2005.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. in Pagden 1995, Pagden 2001, Armitage 1998, Armitage 2000, Mazlish, and Bowden.

<sup>3</sup> Sartori 2006, e.g. p.625. For Sartori’s own discussion of these issues within the context of his own historical researches, see Sartori 2008, pp.60-67.

<sup>4</sup> Sartori 2006, p.640.

“In each of these [examined] cases, history was invoked, not merely to justify imperialism, but *actively* to *reconstruct* it along novel lines. Roadmaps for the future could be derived from history’s inherently reflexive character – its incessant dialectic between a projective future and an interpretable past. This reflexivity afforded a vehicle for imagining those contradictions that experience could not directly resolve. Since historical discourses were relatively open, and gave no definitive answers to imperial questions, they constituted arenas for discussion and debate of rival views. Because it was a genre with immense prestige and enormous popularity, history provided a forum in which popular historians, imperial policy makers, and the larger reading public could work through these imperial questions, groping towards possible consensus. Since this discussion was conducted in a wide range of formats, from novels, to critical essays, to multi-volume national histories, it has never received the attention from imperial historians that it deserves.”<sup>1</sup>

In the historiography of the linguistic studies in Great Britain in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., Hans Aarsleff’s “The Study of Language in England 1780-1680” occupies a position as *the* authority in the field. It first appeared in 1966,<sup>2</sup> and it innovated the field by embedding these linguistic studies within a framework encompassing the broader intellectual issues of the time, and within these it claimed that the linguistic theories should be ascribed a fundamental function. Through a “vindication” of the importance of the until then largely forgotten Horne Tooke’s writings on linguistic topics (and especially on etymologies), Aarsleff re-inscribed the heated linguistic debates roaming within the British intellectual circles back then into the larger philosophical and ideological debates; he demonstrated how these heated linguistic debates both influenced- and were used as a medium to express political fault lines and deeply entrenched rivalries. Hence these debates were anything but isolated from, and insignificant to, society at large; in fact they affected contemporary poetry, politics, ideology, and ultimately even the overseas enterprise in many, both direct and more circumstantial, ways.<sup>3</sup>

The crucial function played by the study of language within the British inscription- and circumscription of Indian society during the latter decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> and the first part of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. has long been acknowledged, and it is well documented, whereas similar research on other contemporary colonial settings has not been carried out to the same extent.<sup>4</sup> J. Errington’s “Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power” from 2008 is one of

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from *Koditschek 2011b*, “Supplementary Notes to the Introduction”, n.7.

<sup>2</sup> That is, the same year as M. Foucault’s “Les Mots et les Choses”; in the Preface to the 2.ed. (1983) Aarsleff commented on it that “exciting though it is, I do not find that its tight schematisms always fit the evidence”.

<sup>3</sup> For studies on these topics in the Victorian period, see e.g. *Burrow 1967* and *Beer*. See also e.g., T.R. Trautmann’s article on “Dr. Johnson and the Pandits: Imagining the Perfect Dictionary in Colonial Madras”. (Reprinted in *Trautmann 2009a*, pp.112-136, org. 2001)

<sup>4</sup> See *Ballantyne 2008*, pp.184-187.

the rare works which have sought to address the issue of colonial philology in a more global context; it operated with a framework spanning from the work of the Spanish friars up to the involvement of linguists employed by the colonial powers in the formation, definition, and implementation of the (proto)national languages in the colonial realm. D.B. Paxman's "Voyage into Language: Space and the Linguistic Encounter, 1500-1800"<sup>1</sup> was more orientated towards the theoretical dimension of-, as well as the epistemological and philosophical queries generated by, the linguistic encounter in the colonial and extra-colonial contact zones; besides, he ended his analysis around the year 1800. However, the idea of the fundamental importance of the notion of spatiality in the linguistic encounters in the colonies and along the ever changing colonial fringes has also influenced my research, as it will become apparent in especially Part II and Part III of this dissertation.

Yet, with the exception of some recent studies of W. Marsden's definition of the Malayo-Polynesian language stock,<sup>2</sup> nearly all recent research on the investigative modalities involved in the British knowledge production in Southeast Asia during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. seems to have prioritized other fields than the linguistic one. Another recent exception to this rule is U. Hillemann's "Asian Empire and British Knowledge: China and the Networks of British Imperial Expansion".<sup>3</sup> In this book, Hillemann set out to examine the different ways in which China and the Chinese were mapped by the British through the themes of language, religion, civilization, race, law, and trade;<sup>4</sup> she also focussed on how the variations in the ascribed importance to each of these themes, or categories, resulted in discrepant matrices of knowledge production within the different contact zones,<sup>5</sup> wherein the actual encounters with China (both as a concept and as a reality) took place.

#### **4. The Life and Careers of John Crawford.<sup>6</sup>**

John Crawford was born on the Isle of Islay on August 13, 1783 as the son of Samuel Crawford, originally a lowlander from Ayrshire and later a residing physician on Islay, and Margaret, nee Campbell, from a family of land proprietors on the island.<sup>7</sup> The parents' matrimony encapsulated the development of Scotland throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> C., as emphasized by G. Knapman; it mirrored the

---

<sup>1</sup> Paxman 2003.

<sup>2</sup> On Marsden's linguistic studies, see Trautmann 2006, and Carroll 2002 as well as Carroll 2011.

<sup>3</sup> Albeit operating with a more prolonged timeframe, L. Liu also discussed the importance of language in the European (and especially British) encounter- and clashes with China in Liu.

<sup>4</sup> Hillemann, p.13. See also pp.189-192.

<sup>5</sup> Hillemann had here obviously appropriated M.L. Pratt's analytical concept of *contact zones*, such as it was discussed and applied in Pratt. These contact zones were situated in the harbour of Canton, along the India-Chinese borderzone of Nepal, and finally in Southeast Asia.

<sup>6</sup> Where nothing else is indicated I have chiefly relied on information provided by C.M. Turnbull in the article on John Crawford in ODNB. (Turnbull)

<sup>7</sup> Thomson 1870, Vol.III, 592.



internal colonization of the highlands that followed in the wake of the battle of Culloden,<sup>1</sup> and which also heralded the introduction of modernity in the form of ‘agrarian patriotism’ and reform.<sup>2</sup> This resulted in the gradual merger of the highlands with the lowlands and the creation of a Scottish nation and an Anglo-Scottish union within the, in theory inclusive, framework of British imperialism. This rather successful amalgamation of two different and asymmetric cultures into a single imagined community was later, in T. Koditschek’s words, invoked by the “liberal imperial unionists who would extend the progress narrative to more distant nations, and different climes”.<sup>3</sup>

As a child Crawford attended the local village school in Bowmore where he, according to himself, received an education to which “he was chiefly indebted for his advancement in life.”<sup>4</sup> It was perhaps here that he made his first acquaintance with conjectural history, and where his interest in the formations and the evolutionary history of society was founded; at all events, this would shortly after be fomented further.

The medical profession “being chosen for him”, as several obituaries put it,<sup>5</sup> Crawford was enrolled at the University of Edinburgh in the year 1800 and graduated three years later. This coincided with a period where several other students who would later become renowned Scottish Orientalists also attended the University of Edinburgh; yet we do not know, as J. Randall stressed, whether Crawford at this stage actually was acquainted with any of these fellow students.<sup>6</sup> The medical learning that he achieved appeared to have been sufficient to secure him a position as assistant surgeon in the East India Company (EIC) service, and he went out to India in 1803. However, it is quite remarkable that in all his subsequent publications he never referred to himself in his capacity as a university educated surgeon, and, furthermore, he would hardly ever take recourse to explicitly medical explanations in any of the publications that followed over the span of the next 65 years – not even in his most biologically orientated discourses on race!

But what he undoubtedly must have taken to his heart during his stay at Edinburgh was the main tenets and principles on the Scottish brand of conjectural history, such as it during these years was lectured by Dugald Stewart in his extremely popular classes on moral philosophy.<sup>7</sup> These would influence him more profoundly than any other idea or thought, and they came to constitute the

---

<sup>1</sup> Knapman 2008a, p.8.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Bayly 1989, pp.155-160, and McLaren 2001, e.g. pp.192-210.

<sup>3</sup> Koditschek 2011, pp.10 & 55.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Thomson 1870, Vol.III, 592.

<sup>5</sup> In the 1870 edition of “A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen” it was claimed that “the medical profession being chosen for him, although he had no particular liking for it, and never excelled in it” (Thomson 1870, vol.III, p.592), whereas the anonymous author of the obituary in the *Anthropological Review* merely stated that “the profession of medicine, for which he never had much taste, having been chosen for him”. (p.324)

<sup>6</sup> Rendall, p.47.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Collini, Winch, and Burrow, pp.25-61; and for the influence of these teachings upon upcoming Scottish Orientalists, see Rendall and McLaren 2001, esp. pp.21-28.

fundamental referential framework in practically all of his writings.<sup>1</sup> In time Crawford would also contribute significantly to the application of this approach in new geographical and historical settings, and later he was instrumental to its gradual conversion into the socio-evolutionary anthropology that came to characterize much of the Mid- and Late-Victorian eras.<sup>2</sup>

There is no indication of Crawford being particularly adept in any kind of oriental scholarship before he went out to India in 1803.<sup>3</sup> Here he took up service in the Northwest Provinces (that is, the area northwest of the Bengal and encompassing Oudh/Awadh), first in the 8<sup>th</sup> Native Infantry (Bengal) and later in the 4<sup>th</sup> Native Cavalry (Bengal).<sup>4</sup> Under the command of Lt. Lake he saw, according to Sir R. Murchison, quite some action during the Mahratta Wars.<sup>5</sup> In 1808 he was transferred to the then small settlement of Penang on Prince of Wales Island in present day Malaysia; here he apparently acquired a proficiency in the Malay language, perhaps to enable him to embark on a new career instead of the medical one which never seemed to have had attracted him much. Notwithstanding whatever motives Crawford may have had, his career was certainly about to change fundamentally when he joined the British invasion of the island of Java in 1811; this invasion was directly under the command of the General-Governor Lt. Minto who would later appoint Raffles as the Lieutenant-Governor of Java. This proved to be a turning point and a decisive moment in Crawford's life and career. On Java, Crawford found ample opportunity to cultivate other fields of the colonial enterprise; he thus developed his statistical skills while producing reports on the nature and distribution of the landed tenure in several districts on central and eastern Java,<sup>6</sup> and he had plenty of opportunity to polish his diplomatic flair and his linguistic proficiencies while occupying the post as Resident at the court of Yogyakarta several times (1811-14 & 1816).<sup>7</sup> He was also employed on diplomatic missions to Bali and Celebes.<sup>8</sup>

Crawford capitalized on the information he had amassed and the knowledge that he gained during these years when he published his three volume "History of the Indian Archipelago" (HIA)

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Crawford would, as we will see throughout this dissertation, rather follow Horne Tooke's linguistic theories than abide by D. Stewart's scathing critique on this. (*Rendall*, pp.50-52)

<sup>2</sup> Thus I here follow G.W. Stocking when he, in explicit opposition to J.D. Burrow's approach (*Burrow 1966*), granted a "sufficient weight to longer-run historical forces that sustained a concern with the relationship of civilization and savagism, and to the perdurance of certain major alternative anthropological orientations over long stretches of intellectual historical time." (*Stocking 1987*, p.xiii; see also pp.294-295)

<sup>3</sup> In this he resembled many of his fellow Edinburgh students who also later excelled in Oriental learning, like, for instance, Mountstuart Elphinstone and Vans Kennedy. (*Rendall*, p.48)

<sup>4</sup> According to the yearbooks from the East-India Register and Directory for the years 1803-1808.

<sup>5</sup> *Murchison*, p.cxlvi. Although only a brief reference, this text nonetheless offers the longest description of Crawford's experiences and military exploits on the Indian subcontinent up to 1808.

<sup>6</sup> This topic has in particular been dealt with in *Bastin 1954b*, and in *Quilty 2001*, chapter 5 (pp.261-298); see also relevant parts of *Carey 2008*, especially, but not exclusively, in chapter 1.

<sup>7</sup> This theme has most thoroughly been dealt with in P. Carey's huge biography on Prince Dipanagara. The prince would later extol the character and capabilities of Crawford, and especially the energy and acumen that he put into acquiring a thorough knowledge of the Javanese language(s), a language which he learnt to master in less than six months (*Carey 2008*, p.109 & 297-298)

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. p.vi in HIA, Vol.I.

in 1820, while being back on a prolonged furlough. Before then he had only published a few articles on the Indian Archipelago and China in the *Edinburgh Review*, and he had had two papers published in the *Asiatick Researches*. These publications, and especially the grand synthesis offered in *HIA*, all appear to have been part of a larger plan to position himself as an authority on the Indian Archipelago, its geography, languages, history, and peoples. This position should then, in due time, abet in securing him a higher rank within the East India Company, and as such they should also be read within a context that emphasizes their function as an integrated part of a deliberate career strategy.<sup>1</sup> While staying in Britain, Crawford also found time to enter into his second matrimony; in 1820 he married the only 18 year old Anne Horatia Perry (1802-1855), a sister to Sir Erskine Perry – later judge in Bombay, Orientalist, and a fellow aspiring radical politician. Unlike many other Indian hands, Crawford appeared to have married at a rather early age, when he around 1808 took a certain Catherine Robertson as his wife. This marriage must hence have been entered while Crawford still stayed in the East. In 1810 she bore him a son; both, however, perished soon after in a shipwreck when they, after she had lost her health in India, were bound for England.<sup>2</sup>

When Crawford returned to active service again in 1821, his first assignment was to lead a difficult diplomatic mission to Siam (Thailand) and Cochin China (southern part of present day Vietnam). Although the practical results of the diplomatic mission were rather meagre, this did not impede Crawford from obtaining the position as Resident<sup>3</sup> in the newly founded colony of Singapore; he occupied this post for three years, leaving his inedible imprint upon the subsequent development of this nascent free trade emporium.<sup>4</sup> It is also in this context that we have one of the rare descriptions of Crawford's character. It was given years later by the learned Malay and colonial scribe, Abdullah Munshi, in his autobiography, and it did certainly not flatter Crawford; yet having been patronized by Raffles – Crawford's contemporary and occasional opponent in the contested field of Southeast Asian knowledge production – one could hardly expect an absolutely unbiased characterization.<sup>5</sup> Thus, Abdullah Munshi's personal and professional allegiances seemed to have had at least some influence upon his evaluation of Crawford when he wrote that:

---

<sup>1</sup> An aspect which has in particular been studied in *McLaren 2001*; here she focussed on the entangled publishing and administrative careers of T. Munro, J. Malcolm, and M. Elphinstone.

<sup>2</sup> *Murchison*, p.clii.

<sup>3</sup> From 1826-1867 Singapore formed, together with Penang and Malacca, part of the administrative unit of the Straits Settlements administered under the auspices of the EIC. But even before then, the administration of Singapore had been subordinated to the Governor of Penang – constituting a presidency since 1805. The senior official of Singapore was entitled Resident, or Resident Councillor; together with the Governor and the Residents of Malacca and Penang, he formed the governing body.

<sup>4</sup> As an example of the recognition of his importance, a group of Singapore merchants as late as 1857 commissioned a portrait of Crawford, costing the not insignificant sum of £300. For more on Crawford's later affiliations with Singapore, see *Webster 2010*. Crawford was, for instance, much more committed to an unencumbered free trade policy than Raffles. (*Turnbull 1972*, p.189; for a reassessment of Raffles as actually a rather protectionist politician, see *Webster 2007*, esp. pp.97-102)

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Munshi & Thomson*, p.192.

“On looking at Mr. Crawford’s disposition, he was impatient, and of a quick temper; but in what he was engaged he did slowly and not immediately. Further, it could be perceived that he was a man of good parts, clever and profound. Yet it was equally true that he was much bent down by a love for the goods of this world. His hand was not an open one, though he had no small opinion of himself. Further, his impatience prevented him from listening to long complaints, and he did not care about investigating the circumstances of the case. As sure as there was a plaint, he would cut it short in the middle. On this account I have heard that most people murmured and were dissatisfied, feeling that they could not accept his decision with good-will, but by force only.”<sup>1</sup>

In 1826 Crawford took over the position as Commissioner of Pegu, recently conquered during the Anglo-Burmese war; after having held this position in 8 months he was elected to be head of a diplomatic mission to Ava, the capital of the Burmese kingdom with the purpose of negotiating a trade agreement with the old enemy. Navigating up the Irrawaddy River in the first steam vessel used in India, the *Diana*, Crawford brought in his entourage the famed naturalist N. Wallich, a Dane who had joined the EIC when the British occupied the Danish colonies and factories in India during the Napoleonic wars.<sup>2</sup> Like the diplomatic missions to Siam and Cochin China, the trade agreement that Crawford negotiated proved to be of only little direct value. Yet both of these diplomatic missions resulted in an enhanced knowledge of the visited countries, and the reports that Crawford subsequently wrote appeared to have been highly appreciated by the EIC. Once more it seemed to be as a knowledge producer that Crawford achieved most success.

This diplomatic mission was his last assignment for the EIC; after this he returned to England, and in the following two years he published two travelogues on these diplomatic missions, both critically acclaimed and later issued in second editions.

Back in Britain, Crawford’s career during the late 1820s and early 1830s has only recently begun to attract the interest of historians. Apart from some references in E. Stokes’ classic study on “English Utilitarians and India”<sup>3</sup> and K.N. Chaudhuri’s commentated reprint of one of his economic

---

<sup>1</sup> This is taken from J.T. Thomson’s translation of excerpts of Abdullah Munshi’s autobiography, the “*Hikayat Abdullah*”. (*Munshi & Thomson*, p.208) On the next page Thomson would add that: “I have read over the character given by Abdulla in the last paragraph to a gentleman who used to meet Mr. Crawford in the Anthropological Society, of which he was president [Crawford was *never* president of the Anthropological Society, but he held that position several times in the competing Ethnological Society; see especially Part IV of this dissertation], and he imagines it to be very correct.” Crawford’s parsimonious behaviour while being Resident in Singapore was also noted by contemporary Europeans; see e.g. *Carey 2008*, p.437 for a description hereof, given by a disgruntled guest at one of his dinner parties.

<sup>2</sup> See *Arnold 2007*.

<sup>3</sup> Mentioned in *Stokes* on e.g. pp.62, 130, & 324. He was also mentioned very briefly in M. Greenberg’s classic study on the opening of the China trade. (*Greenberg*, pp.183-184)

pamphlets,<sup>1</sup> Crawford's influence at this moment of time has not been discussed until A. Webster included him his research on the rise and fall of the Calcutta trading houses, as well as in his studies of the trading networks in Singapore and their connections with Britain.<sup>2</sup> He was also ascribed an important position in U. Hillemann's investigation of "the entangled relationship of missionaries and EIC, philology and religion, Indian precedents and European influence, expansionist interests and a fascination with a foreign culture"<sup>3</sup> in the production of knowledge on China and on the Chinese within the context of the networks of British expansion. Most recently, Y. Kumagai has examined the crucial role played by Crawford in advancing British provincial interests (especially those of Glasgow and Liverpool) in the East India and China trade during the late 1820s and early 1830s – Kumagai even concluded that "in fact, Crawford was the man who linked the provincial mercantile and manufacturing interests with the private traders in the east who had close connections with London's gentlemanly capitalists in the 1829-1833 campaign [to end the EIC monopoly]."<sup>4</sup>

Crawford had in the meantime become a paid agent for the Calcutta merchants in London where he was engaged to speak their cause. Accordingly he published a plethora of pamphlets and articles directed against the very foundation of the EIC, both as a monopolistic trading organization and as a ruler of vast territories, and especially against its continued monopoly on the direct China trade which was up for renewal in 1833.<sup>5</sup> He was also called in as an expert witness by the parliamentary commissions that investigated these questions in the years leading up the final abolition of EIC monopoly on the direct China trade in 1833.

After 1832 he ran unsuccessfully for parliament four times, last time in 1837. He championed the radical cause, and, apart from the continued commitment to anti-monopolistic free trade, he in particular strove to introduce universal suffrage with secret balloting, to reduce public expenditure, especially in the military, and in the perquisites for officeholders, to increase the availability of free education, as well as to nationalize church property and to exempt religious dissenters from extra taxation.<sup>6</sup>

Crawford's fellow compatriot and friend throughout more than four decades, Sir R. Murchison, stated in his obituary that "I have often rejoiced at these political failures; for, from that moment the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Chaudhuri*, pp.14-16. The reprinted pamphlet was "A Sketch of the Commercial Resources and Monetary and Mercantile System of British India, with Suggestions for Their Improvement, by Means of Banking Establishments" from 1837 (pp.217-316)

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. *Webster 2007*, esp. pp.111-117; and *Webster 2010*.

<sup>3</sup> *Hillemann*, p.146. For more on the debates leading up to the abolition of the EIC monopoly on direct China trade in 1833, see pp.171-187.

<sup>4</sup> *Kumagai 2010*, p.199; see also *Kumagai 2008*, esp. pp.124-145 & 217-219.

<sup>5</sup> Y. Kumagai was thus, in my opinion, quite right in stressing that, with regard to published pamphlets, "the contribution of John Crawford to the free trade movement of this period was the most remarkable [of all contributions]" (*Kumagai 2010*, p.182) – both in terms of number and impact.

<sup>6</sup> See *Ellingson*, p.264.

strong mind and untiring energy of the man were devoted almost exclusively to his favourite topics of philology, ethnology, geography, and statistics”.<sup>1</sup> And it seems certain that from the 1840s and onwards Crawford’s knowledge production was increasingly conducted within the frameworks of these nascent scientific disciplines. This retreat from the fields of politics and commercial lobbyism<sup>2</sup> did not imply, however, that his knowledge production became altogether depoliticised. On the contrary, the controversies continued, and they were still primarily framed through the notions of civilization, race and culture. Despite this change of venue, a strain of continuity nevertheless characterized Crawford’s discourses: even though the theoretical queries may have changed, his knowledge production still abided by many of the same methodological approaches, and his discourses continued to be permeated by civilization-orientated referential frameworks.

In 1852 Crawford published “A Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language (2 vols.), the result of more than 40 years of research in that field; in 1856 this was followed by his “A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries”, a thoroughly reworked and rewritten edition of his HIA which, in addition to including much new research, was presented in the format of an encyclopaedia. Apart from these two books, Crawford mostly published articles throughout these years, and the major part of these were printed in the journals of the London based learned societies – like the Transactions of the Ethnological Society, to which Crawford was by far the most active contributor in the 1860s.

During the last decade of his life Crawford seemed more active than ever, and he dedicated all his energies to the scientific scene in London and within the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS). The crucial part played by Crawford in the resurrection of the Ethnological Society around 1860, the breakaway from it of the more polygenetic and racially orientated Anthropological Society in 1863, and the many debates that followed within these and other venues on the origin, nature, and dispersion of man is probably the best described part of Crawford’s life.<sup>3</sup> Once again it was through the terminologies associated with the concepts of civilization, culture, and especially race that these contested questions were articulated, and even if Crawford was not always a central actor in these discussions, his contributions to them nonetheless reveal a lot about their content, discursive manifestations, and their broader contexts. Crawford remained active right up to his death in May 1868.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Murchison*, p.c1. Murchison did not share Crawford’s political opinions, and he was originally a Tory who, due to personal disappointments, later changed to the Whigs. (*Stafford*, p.210)

<sup>2</sup> Crawford, however, continued to be affiliated with the Singapore commercial society and to speak their case; apart from Turnbull’s entry of Crawford in the ODNB, see also *Webster 2010*.

<sup>3</sup> See in particular *Ellingson*; but references to Crawford’s actions, writings, and influence can also be encountered in e.g. *Burrow 1963*, *Burrow 1966*, *Stocking 1971*, *Weber 1974*, *Raininger 1978*, *Stocking 1987* (esp. pp.238-273), *Ellingson* (pp.235-323), *Sillitoe*, *Kenny*, and *Gondermann*.

Widely renowned as a very lively and charming elderly gentleman, Sir F. Galton would later recall how, at the age of 84, he “caught his death illness through handing the ladies to their carriage on the occasion of one of his Soirées, on a bitter night. He died believing in his delirium that he was speaking at the Ethnological Society (since merged into the Anthropological), to which he was devoted.”<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding that this anecdote, recalled some 40 years later, may be somewhat flawed in terms of its truth-value, it does nevertheless seem to represent a quite befitting, and perhaps even enviable, way to end a very long and even more active life!

From this period of his life we also have another long description of Crawford from the hand of Elizabeth Lynn Linton (1822-1898), a female journalist and novelist who during the 1860s participated in the life of the learned societies, and seemed especially devoted to the Ethnological Society. Here she met Crawford, and apparently she became quite fascinated with his charm, wits, and erudition; years later she would include him in her novel “The Autobiography of Christopher Kirkland” (3 vols., 1885), where she gave the following, eulogistic description of him. Whatever one may have opined of him, it seemed evident that Crawford had never been irrelevant to his surroundings:

“When John Crawford ended his long and honoured life, more than I lost a friend whom to know was to love, to respect, to look up to – a man who, if not one of the world’s leaders, yet was one of the world’s helpers – a man who had done his day’s work gallantly and well, and whose character was as sterling as his intellect. No truer soul ever lived than he; no kinder, juster, nor more faithful friend and father. His tall and powerfully built figure, just touched by the hand of time, and slightly, very slightly, bent – his handsome face with the eyes still bright, vivacious, penetrating, where the lightning-lines of latent passion flashed across the sweeter and more placid tracts – his noble, white-haired head, and that look of a man who has won all along the line, and who enjoys and does not regret – all made him one of the most striking features of the learned societies where no one was commonplace. And when he went, a power passed out of those where he had been most often seen, and had had most influence, which left them flavourless – at least to those who had loved him.”<sup>2</sup>

## **5. The Source Material.**

This consists of published and unpublished material, produced by both Crawford and those with whom he communicated, or by those who referred to his writings in their own discourses on colonial knowledge and praxis. In concordance with my intentions of covering a plethora of widely divergent publication media, expressing various discourses, and articulating different authority

---

<sup>1</sup> Galton, p.174.

<sup>2</sup> Linton, E. Lynn: “The autobiography of Christopher Kirkland”, Vol.III, chapter 3.

claims, the published material include 1) historical writings of an all-encompassing, synthetic scope, 2) linguistic treatises such as grammars, dictionaries, and their more philosophical introductions, 3) articles in scholarly journals, particularly but not solely, on ethnological or linguistic topics,<sup>1</sup> 4) travelogues, 5) articles of a more politicised nature, either published as pamphlets or as articles in some of the periodicals which were deeply imbibed in the ideological struggles of the day.

A main contribution to the historiographical fields covered by this dissertation will be its emphasis on the articles published in contemporary journals and periodicals, either written by or referring to Crawford; apart from the ethnological articles published in the 1860s,<sup>2</sup> this aspect has until now only received a scanty attention by historians who have studied Crawford and his discourses. Yet, to the historian the periodical is, as stressed by H. Aarsleff, “indispensable for an understanding of the intellectual quality of periods for which it is available”, given that this kind of literature is particularly apt at revealing “rising interest, controversies, changing views, methods, allegiances, and groupings, and it helps identify leading and innovative figures and ideas.”<sup>3</sup> In short, it can magnify some of the tensions and organizing principles that were often only latently present in the key texts but which, nonetheless, permeated their discourse by both providing the pre-analytic criteria of what constituted the relevant thematic agendas, as well as by allowing a set of prefiguring tropes to establish the authoritative standards regarding style, content, and argumentative mode that the discourse inevitably had to follow if it wanted to provide an ‘authentic’ presentation.

The unpublished material chiefly consists of 1) official reports and correspondence, primarily conducted within the institutional framework of the East India Company, 2) raw drafts of later published articles, 3) unpublished and privately circulated responses to and commentaries on published articles, and 4) private correspondence of a quasi-official nature conducted within the realms of the various Learned Societies and dealing with various topics associated with ‘gentlemanly erudition’; to this occasional Parliamentary Papers on relevant topics should be added.

With this diversity of (connected) texts it is my hope to be able to map some of the ubiquitous aspects and continuous features within the contested fields of colonial knowledge production during this period, as well as I want to detect the main discrepancies and fissures within this field – both in terms of the diachronic dynamics and the synchronic structures. It has to be remembered, though, that both the actual articulation of such ubiquitous aspects and the element of continuity always depended on the specific contexts in which these were produced, transmitted, or received; although

---

<sup>1</sup> And in the reports on the discussions which took place at the meetings after having read the later published papers.

<sup>2</sup> These have often been the subject of study, but they have been most exhaustively examined by T. Ellingson (*Ellingson*), and in particular in D.N. Livingstone’s numerous articles and books on the history of 19<sup>th</sup> C. geography, as well as the geographical history on central themes of human origin and religion within 19<sup>th</sup> C. British intellectual history.

<sup>3</sup> Both quotes are from Aarsleff 1982, p.21.



such concepts as *civilization*, *race*, and *culture* carried with them a certain notion of universal applicability, they would, nonetheless, inevitably have to be, in the words of D.N. Livingstone, “translated into the idioms of local political dialect.”<sup>1</sup> Yet, this should not induce us to blindly succumb to “any straightforward spatial reductionism, or local determinism”.<sup>2</sup> Despite the spatio-temporal grounded-ness of all kinds of discursive utterances, I will here follow A. Satori in stressing the ‘ubiquitous centrality’ of such foundational concepts as civilization, culture, and race, as well as the discourses they generated and from which they derived their (contested) meanings. Instead of defining them as dichotomies, the aspects of 1) conceptual continuity and 2) discursive contingency should be combined into an analytical framework which embraces both the continuous elements of conceptual content and the contextualized and embedded instances of discursive effectivity.<sup>3</sup>

## **6. Content and Structure.**

In the following I will map the contours, follow the changes, and focus on the continuities in Crawford et al’s uses of the concepts of civilization, race, and culture within an array of different colonial discourses. In order to encompass both the discursive diversity and the contextual varieties in which these were invoked, I approach my topic from four different angles that are materialized in each their complementary theme; these are meant to be cumulative, so that each new theme builds upon the analyses and results advanced in the former Parts.

Each of the four major Parts contain 3-4 chapters each which deal with their own separate topics, but in conjunction they contribute to the larger theme dealt with throughout the entire Part and to the argument sustained herein. Each Part is dedicated to an examination of a particular field of knowledge production and implementation; some contain a more diachronic, others a more synchronic analysis. As such they offer each their separate approach to the main theme dealt with in the dissertation – viz. the entangled nature the notions of history, race, and civilization in Crawford’s discourses on especially Southeast Asia, and amongst which the approach grounded in the theme of civilization(s) was the *primus inter pares* throughout the entire the period. This latter aspect (the insistence on the epistemic primacy of civilization) is actually, as far as I can see, the most innovative argument that is advanced in this dissertation; furthermore, it constitutes the recurrent element of attention and the structuring principle of the entire dissertation too.

In the first Part I introduce Crawford’s ideas on the notion of civilization and its colonial entanglements, as well as I discuss its general intersections with the concepts of culture and race,

---

<sup>1</sup> P.179 in *Livingstone 2011*.

<sup>2</sup> *Livingstone 2011*, pp.179-180.

<sup>3</sup> See *Sartori 2005*, esp. pp.698-699, as well as chapter 2 in *Sartori 2008*.

and the importance that these had in the construction of various, competing historical narratives. Chapter 1 begins with an analysis of how civilization and culture during the 1830s offered two conflicting and sometimes complementary approaches to both the domestic sphere and the colonial realm. Taking my point of departure in Crawfurd's complicities in the famous confrontations between S.T. Coleridge and J.S. Mill, I sketch some of the ideological implications and the political potential attributed to these concepts when invoked within this specific context; the chapter ends with a discussion of Crawfurd's notions of civilization in the *singular*, as a uniform and unifying universal force, and in the *plural* where it referred to the similarities and differences within the various manifestations of civilization throughout history and space. Chapter 2 is dedicated to an analysis of the historical background of the idea of civilization, such as it grew out of the Scottish conjectural history and to what this implied in terms of its epistemological configurations. In my analysis of Crawfurd's "History of the Indian Archipelago" special attention is paid to its influence as a provider of the pre-analytical, structuring criteria and to the explanative modes inherent in this approach when applied in a non-European, in casu a Southeast Asian, setting. One of the most important queries here was to account for the progress of civilization in the region; or rather to detect the factors that may have arrested its assumedly *natural progress*. Was it a result of contingent historical events, did climate or geography determine the dynamics, or would racial factors have played the crucial part? The last chapter addresses the question of the influence of race upon the dynamics of civilization; through a diachronic examination of the changes in the explanative potential accorded to this concept in Crawfurd's discourses on Southeast Asia, I try argue that, despite a ubiquitous presence of the race-concept throughout the entire period, its function changed dramatically over time. It thus went from being a topic in need of explanation (explanandum) to constitute an explaining factor in itself (explanans); the discourses changed from being bent on explaining racial differences to offering racial explanations of other phenomena, not at least of the (arrested) growth of civilization.

Part II deals with some of the larger spatio-temporal considerations involved in the making of knowledge *on* the Southeast Asian realm, and on how these (often only tacitly) both presupposed and implied certain epistemes regarding race, culture, and civilization. These, again, simultaneously prescribed and depended on pending political considerations. In the first chapter, I trace the development of the terminologies used to denominate the Southeast Asian Space within British discourses throughout roughly the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., and I examine what conceptual configurations that were ingrained in these terminologies, as well as what they implied for the assessment of the area and its peoples. The next chapter moves from space to time; it contains a parallel analysis of the different systems of historical periodization applied upon this space, and of

what these presupposed as well as implied. The trope of Oriental despotism – its prefiguring influences upon Crawford’s discourses as well the instrumental uses of it herein – compose the central topic in the third chapter. By analysing the manifold manners in which Oriental despotism was conceptualised and represented by Crawford as a learned traveller, philosophical historian, scholar-administrator, and diplomat, I try to situate Crawford’s knowledge production upon the Southeast Asian realm in their broader colonial, cultural, political, and epistemological framework.

In the third, and probably most complex, Part, I undertake a largely synchronic analysis on the field of philology and its colonial applications within the contexts that I have studied in this dissertation. From a bird’s eye view, I intend to identify some of the major points of contestation in which language was involved in colonial knowledge production, and then I delineate their respective epistemic frameworks, theoretical manifestations, and methodological apparatuses. My focus will be directed at the recurrent clashes between 1) a genealogically structured framework, and 2) an approach firmly grounded in the ideas on the stadial evolution of civilization and the assumedly accompanying phenomena such as language. Or, as T.R. Trautmann has dubbed them: 1) the trope of the *tree-of-nations* with its focus on structuring the linguistic, ethnological, and historical phenomena through segmentary lineages and diffusion, and where sameness is assumed as the point of departure “which it then partitions along a calculus of distance”;<sup>1</sup> and 2) “the stepped staircase of progressive succession of forms, the ‘scale of civilization’ that subtends the notion of the stages of social evolution.”<sup>2</sup> It is my argument that most of the colonial knowledge production involving philological methods and/or linguistic evidence can be perceived as an instantiation of the ongoing contest, and the occasional instances of coalescence, between these two master narratives which assumed different guises in the various contexts in which they were invoked and applied. Another topic of interest here is how all the approaches grounded in these two master tropes each possessed their own proclivity towards perceiving the linguistic dynamics in terms of a movement from either unity towards diversity (the genealogical model), or from an original diversity towards ever more unified and entangled structures (the stadial model).

The analysis in the fourth Part goes beyond the purely intra-linguistic sphere. It also departs from the more synchronic structure of the latter Part and assumes the form of a diachronic narrative. Whereas Part III addressed the epistemological dimension as well as the more theoretical aspects of the philological confrontations and of the ideological clashes between the two main approaches of genealogical descent and civilizational progress, I here seek to situate these more firmly within their socio-cultural contexts. It is not my intention merely to provide these contexts as a set of shifting,

---

<sup>1</sup> The quotation is from *Trautmann 1997/2004*, p.10; see pp.7-11 for his definition of these two tropes.

<sup>2</sup> *Trautmann 1997/2004*, p.8.

yet static backgrounds upon which the discursive events discussed here were unfolded, but on the contrary to embed these events firmly within their contemporary social, cultural, political, and intellectual settings. It is the interplay between context and texts (here understood as ‘events’) that interests me; I do not aim merely at charting the manifold manners in which the context framed the events, but also to examine how these events were intricately interwoven into- and constantly reshaped these contexts. With this approach I furthermore endeavour to shift attention from the merely *orientating* influence of context towards its more *constitutive* function: that is, to focus on how these contexts fundamentally formed “the conceptual terrain of discourse and hence the worlds of meaning inhabited by determinate historical subjects”<sup>1</sup> – and thence these contexts also prefigured the life worlds of these historical agents, it demarcated their mental horizons, and thus ultimately it curbed their scope of action.

This fourth Part examines two cases of the complex, continuously contended, and heterogeneous ways in which linguistic evidence gradually gave way to (biologically) racial concerns, without, however, losing all of its influence. The first case address the question regarding the origin and essence of Malayness: this issue was of the highest importance in the delineation of the essence and history of the region, notwithstanding whether ‘Malay’ primarily referred to nation, race, civilization, or language. The next is of a more peripheral nature; here I examine the different ways in which Madagascar was integrated into the historical and ethnological narrative that bound it together with the idea of Malayness that connected the entire super-region stretching from Madagascar to Easter Island, and where the Indian, or Malay, Archipelago occupied the undisputed centre. Always perceived as constituting the uttermost rim of this region, the presence of Madagascar’s black, yet Austronesian speaking, inhabitants seemed to defy any simple explanation; as such it reveals a lot about the referential frameworks in which these studies were inscribed, the fields they generated, and the explanative modes that they privileged. This Part is thoroughly diachronic in its composition; it focuses on a set of *discursive moments* that each were characterised by the publications of a set of key texts on these topics and on the ensuing discussions that these spurred. The analysis thus includes an identification of the major interpretive disjunctions contained in these debates, together with a charting of their intertwined colonial and intellectual contexts.

Through this structure it is my hope to provide a systematic and clear structure that facilitates as well the reading of the dissertation as the understanding of the general argument that I endeavour to sustain and substantiate throughout it. This will hopefully contribute with a more coherent narrative, and produce an easier identifiable and consistent argument that is maintained throughout the entire dissertation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sartori 2006, p.625.

# **Part I. Enter Civilization.**

## **Conceptualizing Civilization and Colonizing the Past.**

“All this points to the fact that societies feel the need to fill areas of consciousness not yet colonized by scientific knowledge with conceptual designators affirmative of their own existentially contrived values and norms.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *White 1978*, p.153; in the Essay “The Forms of Wilderness”



## Crawfurd and Civilization.

“We hear not a little of civilized nations, of the progress of civilization, of savage nations, of barbarian ones, of refinement, and of morals, institutions, improvement, retrogradation, and much more. All this appears abundantly plain and easy.... Every one knows what he means by it – till he is asked; every one knows what it means – till he compares opinions with his neighbour; all nations know what it means – till they compare it with neighbour nations: then nobody knows what it is.”<sup>1</sup>

If nothing else, then this ironical exposure of the contradictory character inherent in the uses of the notion of civilization reveals the ubiquity of this term within virtually all branches of British culture during the nineteenth century. The definition and the extension of civilization, as well as its content, were controversial matters, and the heated debates they caused had ramifications into literature, arts, history, and politics. Although only seldom being in the centre of these events, John Crawfurd was nevertheless deeply involved in debates regarding especially the latter two of these fields throughout more than half a century.

In the following I endeavour to delineate some of the broader contours of the intellectual contexts in which these debates on the definition and the analytical scope of the term civilization were situated; then I analyze the rationale and the sources upon which Crawfurd's texts relied, before turning the attention to the structural aspects of conjectural history in the manner that Crawfurd appropriated and applied it. The idea with this chapter is thus to introduce the concept of civilization, its history, as its intellectual and ideological contexts.

Chronologically, my narrative point of departure will be in the 1830s, and from this decade I will forage both backwards and forwards in time. My motive for this is twofold. This decade was the first that Crawfurd spent back in Great Britain after having retired from the East India Company; as such it can be seen as a period of transition in his career, where he went from being an accomplished scholar-administrator to a well known figure within the metropolitan scientific community, and, besides, this was also the politically most active period of his life. Secondly, within the historiography on the ideas of the (universal) history of man and society in Great Britain, the 1830s has been interpreted widely different by two of the most accomplished scholars in this field, viz. J. Burrow and G.W. Stocking. Burrow primarily interpreted this period as one of rupture – where a by now obsolete conjectural history was substituted by other forms of inquiry;<sup>2</sup> in explicit opposition to this thesis Stocking stressed the importance of the “longer-run historical forces that

---

<sup>1</sup> *London Magazine* Vol.III (1825), p.207.

<sup>2</sup> *Burrow* 1966, in this context see esp. ch.2-3.

sustained a concern with the relationship of civilization and savagism”.<sup>1</sup> Whereas I do not aspire to provide any definitive answer to this problem in this chapter, it is still my hope to be able to contribute with some new insights to this interesting question raised by Burrow and Stocking throughout the course of this dissertation.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stocking 1987*, p.xiii.



# 1. Contextualizing Civilization and Culture in the 1830s.

“These *ingredients of civilization* are various, but consideration will satisfy us that they are not improperly classed together. History and their own nature, alike show, that they begin together, always coexist, and accompany each other in their growth. Wherever there has introduced itself *sufficient knowledge of the arts of life, and sufficient security of property and person*, to render the *progressive increase of wealth and population* possible,<sup>1</sup> the community becomes and continues progressive in all the elements which we have just enumerated. All these elements exist in modern Europe, and especially in Great Britain, in a more eminent degree, and in a state of more rapid progression, than at any other place or time.”<sup>2</sup>

In these words did John Stuart Mill emphasize, what to him appeared to be, the most prominent features of the concept of ‘civilization’ in an article published in The London and Westminster Review, and simply entitled “Civilization”.<sup>3</sup> Among these features, the notion of progression played an essential role in defining civilization, and not at least in delineating its characteristics. The article focussed on how the *gradual* progression had occasioned “extraordinary alterations in institutions, opinions, habits, and the whole of social life, which they brought in their train”; but this was not the most important aspect, and, as stressed by J.S. Mill, there was “not a more accurate test of the progress of civilization than the progress of the power of co-operation”.<sup>4</sup>

Meanwhile, the primacy of the notion of progress in the context of civilization was established at the very beginning of the article by contending that “the word civilization, like many other terms of the philosophy of human nature, is a word of double meaning. It sometimes stands for *human improvement* in general, and sometimes for *certain kinds* of improvement in particular”.<sup>5</sup> J.S. Mill was thus in accordance with what most eighteenth-century English, and especially Scottish, thinkers had said about universal history when he proclaimed the idea (of the possibility) of general progress as the constituting the normal, and indeed *natural*, modus in which the history of mankind universally had evolved. And this was despite the occasional setbacks which, however, always proved to be of a temporally and/or spatially localised nature.<sup>6</sup> In J.S. Mill’s interpretation, this resulted in what seems to be an equation between “*human improvement in general*” and the notion

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark that J.S. Mill here writes that these attributes of civilization render progress possible rather than necessary.

<sup>2</sup> *Mill 1836*. The quotation is taken from pp.2-3; the italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> As Levin points out, this article is not included in corpus of Mill text which are normally referred to. (Levin pp.18-25)

<sup>4</sup> *Mill 1836*, pp.3 & 4.

<sup>5</sup> *Mill, 1836*, p.1.

<sup>6</sup> In concordance with this, Spadafora argued that, although some prominent individuals throughout the whole period claimed the superiority of the ancient times over the modern ones, the predominant trend was nevertheless that “the idea of progress was the normal vision of history in high eighteenth-century Britain, and it became increasingly dominant as the period proceeded. Probably more than at any other time in British history, including the Victorian era, when educated men of the age looked back to the past or forward to the future, when they engaged in recollection or foresight or both, what they usually saw, in various shapes, was progress.” (*Spadafora*, p.18)

of civilization; this, together with the more particular kinds of improvement which sometimes were labelled as civilization as well, appear in this discourse to conform with the characteristics of “a state of high civilization being the *diffusion of property and intelligence, and the power of co-operation*”.<sup>1</sup> If these elements were perceived as constituting an integrated analytical system and a referential framework, they could be invoked to describe and explain both the moral, historical, political, and cultural aspects of society; as such they expressed what G.W. Stocking has termed “civilization as an issue of attitude and method.”<sup>2</sup> In this case, like in most others, these elements were applied not only to *describe* an actual situation, but also to *prescribe* the ways of changing this situation by enunciating a plea for “democratic” reforms of the political system, so that it corresponded better to the fact “that by the *natural growth of civilization*, power passes from individuals to masses”, and especially for reforms of the English universities<sup>3</sup> - both for preparing the masses for assuming the political power and more particularly stressing “the reforms in education necessary for regenerating the character of the higher classes.”<sup>4</sup> As such, civilization was here invoked and pleaded as an unequivocally evaluative-descriptive concept in which the normative dimension seamlessly merged with the cognitive value vested in the term ‘civilization’.

### **1.1. Defining and Demarcating Civilization.**

Another person who in the years from 1834 to 1836 also published extensively in The London and Westminster Review (WR) was the former East India Company civil servant, prominent Orientalist, and during these years aspiring politician John Crawfurd. Crawfurd championed the Radical cause and campaigned, without any success, for parliament in both London and Scotland.<sup>5</sup> In this aspect he was less fortunate than another Scottish radical MP, Joseph Hume, who was his old friend and fellow East India Company veteran; some years before they had together launched a campaign against the East India Company.<sup>6</sup> Always an ardent advocate of free trade and laissez faire principles, Crawfurd had from the very onset of his publishing career<sup>7</sup> been critical towards the

---

<sup>1</sup> Mill, 1836, p.6.; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Stocking 1987, p.36.

<sup>3</sup> This was particularly directed towards the *English*, and not the Scottish, universities, which then were considered by most people to be better than the British; or in the words of W. Bagehot in 1855: “the system of Edinburgh is enormously superior to that of Cambridge. The *particular, compact, exclusive learning of England* is inferior to the *general, diversified, omnipresent information of the North*.” (Quoted in Collini, Winch & Burrow, p.23). But, as J. Burrow earlier had pointed out, it was, however, exactly in the 1830s that the “distinctive Scottish educational tradition” began to deteriorate. Burrow 1966, p.64.

<sup>4</sup> Mill, 1836, pp.8,9, & 28.

<sup>5</sup> Mentioned on p.264 in Ellingson.

<sup>6</sup> Taylor 2007a, pp.292-293. Taylor wrongly claims that Crawfurd returned to England in 1824; in that year he was still Resident in Singapore, and he did not return until 1827; see the entries in the *East-India Register and Directory*.

<sup>7</sup> For instance in *Crawfurd 1817a*, *Crawfurd 1818*, and *HIA*. In this category should *The Present System of our East-India Government and Commerce considered* from 1813 also be included, if it is authored by Crawfurd, such as J. Bastin claims (*Bastin 1953*), while E. Stokes (*Stokes*, p.323) states that it was written by Mr. Rickards, MP. In the *Earl Grey Pamphlets Collection*, authorship is, however, ascribed to Alexander Nowell.

monopolistic nature of the great European trading companies, such as the Dutch Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC),<sup>1</sup> as well as his own employer, the English East India Company (EIC). After his resignation in 1827, this critical attitude turned outright inimical in a series of pamphlets published on the, according to Crawford, absent legitimacy, the questionable economical expediency, and not at least the dire implications of arresting rather than abetting the progress of civilization in the regions which were under the sway of EIC rule.<sup>2</sup> These questions were especially contested in the period up to 1833 where the Company's monopoly of the China trade expired. Just as in J.S. Mill's article, the notion of civilization was in Crawford's discourses more than merely an analytical concept through which both the universal history of mankind and the unique history of each region could be assessed and evaluated. Simultaneously it constituted a contested political field where the legitimacy of past and present, as well as the possible future, paths of progress were debated in terms of *what* the notion of civilization implied and *how* its trajectories could be analytically determined as well as politically delineated. Furthermore, these debates did not only take place *within* the discursive realm demarcated by the concept of civilization; the very applicability of the notion of civilization as representing the most adequate way of approaching the political field was questioned too. The wide scope, as well as the intertwined nature, of these debates throughout 1820s and 1830s can be sketched through a brief exhibition of the ways in which Crawford, J.S. Mill, and S.T. Coleridge used and combined the notion of civilization and the embryonic ideas of *culture* in their politically charged disquisitions.<sup>3</sup>

James Mill, J.S. Mill's father, had, like Crawford, attended Edinburgh University in the years 1790-1793,<sup>4</sup> and before they wrote their acclaimed, albeit not uncontended, histories of India and the Indian Archipelago, they had both had published articles in the Edinburgh Review (ER).<sup>5</sup> Their shared ideas on the content and the importance of the concept of civilization is reflected in the manner in which Crawford later appraised James Mill's magnum opus,<sup>6</sup> even though he did not

---

<sup>1</sup> The VOC had been formally dissolved in 1800, after decades of economic crisis, and the administration of the Dutch East Indies had been transferred to a 'Council for Asian Affairs', but according to Crawford, like to most Britons, the new administration continued to rule along the old, monopolistic lines. On the liquidation of the VOC and its implications for the administration of East Indian possessions, see e.g. *Vlekke*, ch.XI. Other contemporary examples of an opinion kindred to Crawford's can be encountered in the writings by e.g. C. Assay (former secretary to Raffles while being Lt.-Governor on Java) in *Assay 1816* and *Assay 1819*. Recently, however, U. Bosma has argued that argued that the, among especially the British, so maligned "Cultivation System", introduced in 1830, did not exclude the British from trading on Java to the degree which they themselves claimed; see, *Bosma*.

<sup>2</sup> These comprised *Crawford 1828b*, *Crawford 1829b*, *Crawford 1828c*, *Crawford 1830a*, *Crawford 1830b*, and *Crawford 1831*.

<sup>3</sup> In the following I will just offer a brief illustration rather than a thorough analysis of Crawford's complicity in, and contributions to the development and use of these ideas of civilization and culture.

<sup>4</sup> *Rendall*, p.45

<sup>5</sup> On James Mill's affiliation with the Edinburgh Review and the influence of the Scottish tradition on his work, see *Burrow*, 1966, pp.42-49. The newest work devoted specially to James Mill's writings on India is *Majeed 1992*.

<sup>6</sup> In HIA, Vol.III, pp.52 & 53 Crawford thus lauded Mill's "History of British India" in unmistakable terms.

always share Mill's hyper-critical judgement of the Asiatic societies;<sup>1</sup> and, as already mentioned, Crawford would later also publish in the same periodical as James Mill's son.<sup>2</sup> Yet, James Mill's ideas deviated in many important aspects from the more traditional tenets of the Scottish brand of conjectural history, the principles of which he was inculcated during his more youthful years. Instead James Mill affiliated himself with the utilitarian doctrines of J. Bentham<sup>3</sup>, and, in continuation of this, J.S. Mill, in the words of J. Burrow, "obviously knew the work of the Scottish eighteenth-century historians, but seems to have derived little inspiration from them as philosophers of history".<sup>4</sup> Nor was "a traditional conjectural historian" necessarily the most apt description of Crawford's analysis of past and present society, as it will be elucidated later in this Part; however, unlike James Mill, he still by and large adhered to a broader and more multifaceted definition of civilization – especially in the assessment of the progress of non-European societies.<sup>5</sup> Still, despite these disagreements in attitude and approach, there exists no incentive which should induce us to infer that Crawford would not have concurred with the main elements in the definition of civilization asserted by J.S. Mill in the abovementioned article. The differences in the two chosen subject areas – between J.S. Mill's analysis and critique of present British society and Crawford's interest in the Indian Archipelago – seem to have spurred a related discrepancy in their rhetorical strategies through which they defined and discriminated between the different levels of civilization.

One of the fundamental aspects of the British, and especially the Scottish, approach to civilization as an analytical concept was that the progress of society was conceived to unfold itself through a continuous series of *stages*, each being a step towards a higher level of civilization.<sup>6</sup> To some this stadial theory constituted the *idealized* version of what was allegedly the *natural* and *universal* mode of progression of society; in their rhetorical strategies, however, these writers often discursively contrasted civilization with either savagery, barbarism, or merely a "rude state of

---

<sup>1</sup> I thus concur with J. Rendall when she concludes that: "Though these writers [the other Scottish Orientalists, Crawford included] shared Mill's historical framework, their work was to offer more perceptive, as well as better informed, views of a range of Indian societies" (Rendall, p.61).

<sup>2</sup> Although Crawford actually appeared to have stopped publishing in the Westminster Review once the Mills took over control it; this theme will be discussed more at depth in Part IV of the dissertation.

<sup>3</sup> Although deeply influenced by J. Bentham, James Mill disagreed with him regarding the relative influence of the elements of universalism and "cultural relativity" in their approaches to and the (possible) governance of non-European, and especially Indian, society. J. Majeed thus point out that "in fact Bentham was much more moderate than Mill", and "he felt a certain regard was due to indigenous institutions, using them as far as possible to effect reforms, rather than substituting them wholesale" (p.12 in Majeed 1990). J. Pitts argues even more strongly for this point, stressing that: "it is important to read Bentham against the Mills", and "James Mill combined elements of various strands of thought most notably utilitarianism and Scottish conjectural history, whose main expositors had questioned the justice of colonization: in combining these strands Mill developed a case for civilizing empire that had not existed in Bentham's thought". (p.202 in Pitts 2003)

<sup>4</sup> Burrow, 1966, p.63. See also Stocking 1987, pp.38-39.

<sup>5</sup> Pp.117-124 in Trautmann 1997/2004, and Rendall, p.61. See also Macfie, pp.175-179 and Koditschek 2011, pp.66-71 & 82-90.

<sup>6</sup> Spadafora argues that while many English eighteenth-century philosophers foresaw a process of "infinite progress", often associated with Christian connotations, their Scottish counterparts "depicted history, in the march from rudeness to refinement, as broadly progressive within certain temporal and cultural limits." (Spadafora p.212; see esp. ch.6 & 7)

society” in a dialectical opposition. In delineating the more specific content contained in his concept of civilization J.S. Mill thus stated that: “we shall in the present article invariably use the word civilization in the narrow sense: not that which is synonymous with improvement, but that in which *it is contrary to rudeness or barbarism*. Whatever be the characteristics of what we call *savage life*, the contrary of these, or rather *the qualities which society puts on as it throws of these, constitute civilization*.”<sup>1</sup> Then he continued with enumerating the characteristics that positively defined ‘savage life’, or ‘barbarism’, which appeared to be synonymous in this specific discourse: these societies were organized in *tribes*, only *few in number*, thinly scattered, and accustomed to *wandering* over vast tracts of country. Then Civilization was defined as characterizing the exact opposite situation, viz. being applicable to societies consisting of a *dense population*, the inhabitants of which dwell in *fixed habitations*, largely collected in *towns and villages* – the latter apparently presupposed the existence of a governmental structure beyond the tribal level. In short, on the surface of the discourse, civilization and savage life/barbarism constituted two antithetical entities which were both autonomously defined in terms of their own positive content. However, when describing this barbarism, or savage life, in more detail it became clear that its content was not of a positive nature, but, on the contrary, it only occupied a void epistemological space, defined by *the absences of the marks of civilization*.<sup>2</sup> It lacked the material foundation of civilization, and in “savage life there is no commerce, no manufactures, no agriculture, or next to none”; “nor do savages find much pleasure in each other’s society”; this almost pre-contractual<sup>3</sup> non-sociality had resulted in a virtual absence of any social system that devised laws, offered administration of justice, and which through collective means sought to protect persons and property.<sup>4</sup> J.S. Mill thus reduced the ‘barbarian Other’ to a hollow rhetorical figure – an empty category that inversely projected, and in this way magnified, the benefits of civilization which constituted to only object of real interest in this discourse;<sup>5</sup> thence rudeness represented nothing but a lack of refinement here.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Mill 1836*, p.2; my italics. J.S. Mill did not here distinguish between ‘barbarism’ and ‘savage life’, as some of the Scottish conjectural historians did. These distinctions will be elaborated later in ch.1. See also *Bowden*, pp.32-34.

<sup>2</sup> In addressing “The Forms of Wildness: Archaeology of an Idea” H. White similarly focused on how these “functioned as components of sustaining cultural myths and as parts of the *game of civilizational identification by negative definition*”; (p.153), pp.151-182 in *White 1978*. (My italics)

<sup>3</sup> J.S. Mill thus emphasized that “every one trust to his own strength or cunning, and where that fails, he is without resource”. The theories of Scottish conjectural history had manifestly departed from the contractual approach, and since D. Hume it had been claimed that Man can only be assessed within the framework of society; “Man was recognized by the Scots to be an inherently social creature” (*Spadafora*, p.314); for a more detailed analysis of this aspect, see esp. pp.230-236 in *Poovey*. This trend continued in the burgeoning discipline of ethnology, so that Crawford in 1861 with the same clarity as his Scottish predecessors could state that “the truth is, that the rudest savages ever discovered by civilized nations have not been in a state of nature. All had made some advances towards civilization”, *Crawford 1861a*, p.155.

<sup>4</sup> All these examples and quotes are taken from *Mill 1836*, p.2.

<sup>5</sup> In this discourse ‘barbarism’ thus played the same role as the ‘Orient’, according to E. Said, allegedly played in most Western discourses on that topic throughout history, viz. that providing a distorting mirror which served to accentuate the superiority of the West (or, in casu, the present) rather than solely describing the ‘Orient’ per se. See *Said*, e.g. p.22.

Neither were Crawford's discourses devoid of such a rhetoric, emphasizing the dialectical opposition between savagery and barbarism on the one hand and civilization on the other; such instances were especially replete in the parts of the discourse where he chastised the governmental structure of present indigenous societies, and then passed severe judgements upon their allegedly antiquated, or perhaps even degenerated, nature. Yet, it seems that even in most of these instances Crawford inscribed the savage and the barbarian categories into a framework where the savage or barbarian Other were conceived in terms of a *temporalized difference*, which at once 1) distanced contemporaneous, co-existing societies as being representatives of different Ages of Man, and *at the same time*, 2) drew all these societies together by situating them along a unifying time-line. This was in accordance with the tenets of Scottish conjectural history and, as J. Fabian has demonstrated, with much of the modern anthropology too.<sup>2</sup> In having to describe, classify, and distinguish between present societies, which putatively differed civilization-wise, Crawford's texts were usually structured along an ascending scale composed of different stages civilization, and, although this scale often only was tacitly assumed, it nevertheless proved to be pervasive. In defining these stages and sublevels he employed a set of various criteria which, though intimately interconnected, still served as well to subdivide as to identify the different levels. The number of instances of such classification and identification are abundant throughout Crawford's prolific textual production, and since these will be examined more thoroughly later, I will here restrict myself to offer only a few, illustrative examples. In describing the "Manners and Character of the Indian Islanders" in 1820, Crawford stressed that, even among the most improved societies in the region, civilization was still "in an early stage", and the implications of this was that "even their best forms of government are wretched, and confer little security on person and property".<sup>3</sup> In this assertion he did not deviate much from what J.S. Mill had stated in the excerpt mentioned above; but the more gradual structure of the idea of civilization were far more often practiced in Crawford's discourses. Like, for instance, when he chose to "follow the *natural progress of the arts in the march of civilization*"; "arts" here primarily referred to the artisan's crafts and his production of tools and manufactures.<sup>4</sup> Or when he provided both a specific and a more general criterion for civilization in "A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries" from 1856; here Crawford claimed that: "the *invention or possession of phonetic writing* may be considered a fair criterion of civilization, and

---

<sup>1</sup> It should here be emphasized that J.S. Mill, who like his father was employed in the East India Company service, without, however, ever visiting the East, also wrote texts that dealt much more directly with Indian society and the British colonial project there. The classical work on this is Stokes' "English Utilitarians and India" (Stokes); for a more recent treatment of this topic, see *Kurfirst*.

<sup>2</sup> Fabian, see e.g. p.16.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.43.

<sup>4</sup> Quote from HIA, Vol.I, p.156; my italics. See also *Spadafora*, pp.53-76 on the distinction and assumed connections between *art* in the sense of the artisan's craft and technology on the one hand, and the so-called 'fine arts' on the other, as well as for their implementation in the analysis of the progress of civilization and Mankind.

*density of population* evidence of the relative extent to which it has been carried”.<sup>1</sup> One of his later articles actually bore the telling title “On the Numerals as evidence of the Progress of Civilization”.<sup>2</sup>

Through these examples I have attempted to illustrate some of the ambiguities ingrained in the notion of civilization as it was used in the first half of the nineteenth century, and to show how the discrepancies in its content and meaning did not only depend on the different interpretive traditions, but also on the specific intellectual and political contexts in which they were situated. And this even when produced by relatively kindred spirits, such as J.S. Mill and Crawford. Within the manifestly political field where J.S. Mill articulated his ideas on civilization, it appeared opportune to approach and apply the notion of civilization in a strictly dichotomised “Us-Them” division: here civilization constituted a fixed entity, instead of representing a dynamic process, and it was taken to consist of all that was absent in its conceptual counterpart: barbarism, or savage life. When, like in Crawford’s earlier discourses, applied more as an analytical concept in an (intended) less controversial knowledge production, the notion of civilization tended to be framed within a more process-orientated structure of stadial progression.

## **1.2 Challenging Civilization and Posing Culture as a Counter-Concept.**

G.W. Stocking has, rightly I think, stressed “the fact that for the Enlightenment, there was civilization, but no culture in the modern anthropological sense.”<sup>3</sup> This state of affairs proved pervasive in Great Britain during the first half of the nineteenth-century. During this period most of the leading British intellectuals either ignored or were unaware of the German concept of ‘Kultur’, or Culture; this was despite the fact that this concept originally grew out of theoretical queries kindred to those that gave birth to the idea of civilization within the framework of conjectural history,<sup>4</sup> and it did so within interrelated and intertwined intellectual circles.<sup>5</sup> The cultural approach, with its emphasis on the ways in which each particular language, in a genuinely original manner,

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1856, p.260; my italics. (From the entry on ‘Man’) In Crawford 1867a a similar verdict was passed: “of one thing we may be sure, that no people ever invented phonetic writing, or even adopted that of strangers, who had not made a considerable advance in civilization” (p.98). On Vico’s, Rousseau’s, and other eighteenth-century theories on this matter, see Eco, pp.166-168. A more thorough analysis can be found in Hudson 1994.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1863b.

<sup>3</sup> Stocking 1987, p.19.

<sup>4</sup> Palmeri 2008; Palmeri even defines it as “a third variety” of conjectural history (along with the Scottish and the French versions), and it was characterized by how it “generally stress the organic nature of society” (pp.6-7). See also Kroeber and Kluckhohn’s classical study of the concept of culture and its contexts (*Kroeber & Kluckhohn*). For the complicities and clashes of the concepts of culture and civilization in an imperial context, see Bowden, esp. pp.23-76; and Sartori 2005 and Sartori 2008, pp. 25-67 for a discussion of these within a global framework.

<sup>5</sup> This was especially the case with the University of Göttingen, which during the latter part of the 18<sup>th</sup> C. housed or was closely associated with prominent universal historians like Michaelis, Schlözer, and Herder (For an analysis of the contemporary German ethnographical theories and how they influenced Herder, see ch.6 (pp.233-268) in Stagl 1995 and Aarsleff 1967/1983, pp.143-154. For more on the “Anglo-Göttingen” connection, see Jefcoate.

framed a different life-world for each people or nation,<sup>1</sup> is in traditional historiography most often presented as being conceived by Herder, and then germinated in the fertile mould of the Romantic movement, before it finally ripened in W. von Humboldt's linguistic philosophy.<sup>2</sup> These ideas were intimately connected with comparative philology, such as this was particularly carried out within the genealogical study of the origin and diffusion of language *families*. However, as H. Aarsleff has demonstrated<sup>3</sup> and as T. Benes recently has reiterated<sup>4</sup>, such an approach to the linguistic field did not gain many followers on the British Isles until relatively late, until the 1830s, despite the fact that it was Sir William Jones' path breaking studies which paved the way for the study of these topics.<sup>5</sup>

In the British context the advent of *culture* as either an analytical concept, as a contested (political) field, or as both, is often traced to the debate between M. Arnold and E.B. Tylor, and to the conflicting ways in which these two invoked the term in the period ranging from the 1850s to the 1870s. For Arnold the concept referred to by the term *culture* first and foremost constituted a political field,<sup>6</sup> and he had "defined culture in opposition to civilization. For him, culture meant the harmonious development of humanity's highest faculties"<sup>7</sup>, and *culture*, in his interpretation, would articulate itself "through the voices of human experience...of art, science, poetry, philosophy, as well as of religion".<sup>8</sup> Absent in this enumeration were all references to civilization's more material components, such as production, commerce, and agricultural pursuits. This was no coincidence; as R. Handler wrote: "Arnold conceived of culture as an antidote to the England of his time, that is, to a society he deemed too exclusively devoted to the external and practical pursuits of economic development."<sup>9</sup> In contrast, as G.W. Stocking has pointed out, Tylor sought to redeem not only Great Britain's material civilization but also its culture (in the present day meaning of the term), and more specifically, in his capacity as an anthropologist, he sought to reclaim the analytical value of the notion of civilization, which then, as an overt challenge to Arnold's discourse, was re-baptized

---

<sup>1</sup> In the eighteenth- and early nineteenth century the terms 'people', 'nation', and 'race' (and sometimes 'civilization' too) were used rather interchangeably; later, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the meanings and uses of these terms became more fixed and they assumed each their conceptually demarcated spaces within the epistemological grid. These changes will be examined more in depth in the next parts of this dissertation. See also *Trautmann 2004*, pp.190-192 and *Trautmann 2005*.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. *Stocking 1987*, pp.20-25 and the article on 'Culture' in *Williams 1983*, pp.87-93. Williams draws the attention to the fact that W. von Humboldt actually used the word 'civilization' for what is nowadays meant by the term 'culture', and with 'culture' he referred to what most of his British contemporaries would call 'civilization'. See also *Sartori 2005*, pp.683-686 for a recent analysis of Humboldt's uses of the terms *culture*, *civilization*, and "*Bildung*".

<sup>3</sup> *Aarsleff 1967/1983*, see ch.4-5, e.g. pp.142-143. Herder's linguistically revolutionary "Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache" (1771) was thus not published in English until 1827 ("Treatise upon the Origin of Language") (*Aarsleff 1967/1983*, p.148)

<sup>4</sup> Pp.121-124 in *Benes 2004* and *Benes 2008*, chapters 1-3.

<sup>5</sup> An interesting aspect of the influence of German philology and idealism on British intellectual history in the nineteenth-century is examined in *Burrow 1967*.

<sup>6</sup> In terms of what nowadays probably would be labelled "cultural politics".

<sup>7</sup> *Handler*, p.451.

<sup>8</sup> From M. Arnold's "Culture and Anarchy" (1869), quoted in *Amigoni*, p.1.

<sup>9</sup> *Handler*, p.449.



as *culture*.<sup>1</sup> Hence Tylor's concept of culture was directly, and consciously, derived from the older notion of civilization, and if not identical with this, they at least shared the same premise, viz. that the material and more "spiritual" conditions of any given society tended to be entwined and develop along parallel and mutually dependent trajectories.

Before this, the term *culture* primarily referred to the process of "cultivating something", and usually this was associated with the process of agriculture. During the eighteenth- and early nineteenth centuries *culture*, together with its derivations *cultivation* and *cultivated*, was increasingly applied metaphorically, as alluding to, for instance, social or educational aspects of society.<sup>2</sup> However, in English language the first consistent transplantation of the term from the realms of agriculture to the field of politics and ideology seems to have been carried out by S.T. Coleridge. In his entry on the term *civilization*, R. Williams traced "a decisive moment" to 1830s England; he presented this period as a veritable battleground between the contrasting notions of, on the one hand, *civilization*, such as this was expressed by J.S. Mill,<sup>3</sup> and on the other Coleridge's notion of *culture*, or *cultivation* which was formulated clearest in his political tract "On the Constitution of Church and State" from 1830.<sup>4</sup> This text was not only staunchly anti-utilitarian in its lamentation of the present political reforms,<sup>5</sup> but Coleridge went on to attack the very foundations of both utilitarianism and conjectural history with its notion of stadial evolution. Inspired by German Idealism and Romanticism,<sup>6</sup> he questioned the materialistic focus ingrained in both the concept of civilization and in the mechanistic ways of assessing Nature and Man. Instead he claimed that:

"All these [permanency of the state, its progressiveness, and the personal freedom] were dependent on a continuing and progressive civilization; but civilization is itself but a mixed good, if not far more a corrupting influence, the hectic of disease, not the bloom of health, and a nation so distinguished more fitly to be called a varnished than a polished people;

---

<sup>1</sup> Here referring to G.W. Stocking's "Matthew Arnold, E.B. Tylor and the Uses of Invention" (1963), which with R. Williams' "Culture and Society, 1780-1850" are the authoritative works on this topic; see also *Amigoni*, pp.110-112.

<sup>2</sup> For a concise view of the this term, and of the concept with which it in time became synonymous, see the reference to 'Culture' in *Williams 1988*, pp.87-93. Already in "Of the Proficiency and Advancement of Learning", Francis Bacon had entitled a subchapter "The Culture of the Mind", and this metaphor appeared often throughout his discourse.

<sup>3</sup> As, for instance, in his essay on Coleridge (1840), and to this the abovementioned article on "Civilization" should be added.

<sup>4</sup> *Williams 1988*, pp.58-59. However, it has to be noted that the term *culture* does not appear at all in (at least the 1. edition of) "On the Constitution of Church and State" from 1830; *cultivation*, however, in the meaning associated with the modern term *culture* appears at least thrice.

<sup>5</sup> *Majeed 1990*, pp.216-218 and especially *Majeed 1992*, pp.172-173.

<sup>6</sup> See the entry on S.T. Coleridge in the ODNB (*Beer*). This approach was illustrated in his discussion of the philosophical meanings and connotations of the German terms "reine Anschauung" and "Empfindung", such as these were employed by some of the major German philosophers of his day. In *Coleridge 1830*, pp.219-221. (Pagination is here and in the following from the 1830 edition; it differs in the various editions)

where this civilization is not grounded in *cultivation*, in the harmonious development of those qualities and faculties that characterize our *humanity*".<sup>1</sup>

This "permanent *distinction*, and occasional *contrast*, between cultivation and civilization"<sup>2</sup> drew a wedge into the very core of the notion of civilization as a unifying, all embracing concept; it deliberately dissociated the prescriptive dimension from the descriptive, and it destabilized its validity as an unchallenged trope of progression, with its inherent tinge of positive moral connotations as an inherently descriptive-evaluative term. Instead, Coleridge offered a particularistic and historicist approach with the concept of *Nation*<sup>3</sup> as a central element: "to understand this most valuable of lessons taught by history, and exemplified alike in her oldest and her most recent records – that a *nation* can never be too *cultivated*, but may easily become an *over-civilized race*".<sup>4</sup> *Cultivation*, or *culture*, was thus offered as both an analytical alternative, or at least as a complement, to civilization, as well as a counter-measure to its political and ideological implications. This approach also influenced the use of- and meanings attributed to the term *civilization* in Coleridge's text. Discursively, civilization seems here to have been used in three different functions: as already mentioned, it was contrasted with *cultivation*, as constituting the mindless progress that was blind towards its own inner values and heritage.<sup>5</sup> This was undoubtedly its most important function, but in other instances civilization was used neutrally,<sup>6</sup> as referring to roughly the same as when J.S. Mill or Crawford used the term, but here derived of the more benign elements in its meaning. Finally it could also be attributed a more positive value, when used in conjunction with either *nation*<sup>7</sup> or even more when paired with the idea of the *National Church*.<sup>8</sup> Six years later, in the article on "Civilization", J.S. Mill invoked Coleridge's use of these terms in order to counter them: thus polemizing implicitly against Coleridge he stressed how "the Church, professedly the other great instrument of *national culture*, long since perverted (...) into the great instrument of preventing all *culture*".<sup>9</sup> Otherwise he also referred to "a *system of cultivation*", or a "*sort of cultivation*" which was the "accompaniment of civilization", and when used prudently – that is, in concordance with J.S. Mill's own political ideas – this would serve the function of

---

<sup>1</sup> Coleridge, 1830, p.43; the italics are Coleridge's own.

<sup>2</sup> Coleridge, 1830, p.50; Coleridge's italics.

<sup>3</sup> In this discourse *nation* thus attained many of the traits with which it since most often has been associated, instead of merely being used synonymously with *tribe*, *people*, *race*, or *nation*.

<sup>4</sup> Coleridge 1830, p.50; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> Although only used explicitly in this meaning thrice (Coleridge 1830, pp.43, 47 & 50), these instances appear to have formed some of the more decisive nodal points in the text.

<sup>6</sup> Coleridge 1830, pp.20, 23, 43, 56 & 95.

<sup>7</sup> Coleridge 1830, pp.52 & 56.

<sup>8</sup> Coleridge 1830, pp.57, 74, 79, 87, 131. Furthermore, on p.164 (European) civilization was contrasted with (Mahomet's) despotism. With regard to its affiliated forms, 'civilized' was the only one used frequently, and this prefix was bestowed rather indiscriminately upon both *Men/Man* (pp.18, 49, 77, 132), *country* (p.22), *race* (p.50), *world* (pp.60 & 132), *realm* (p.77), and *society* (p.77).

<sup>9</sup> Mill 1836, p.10.

strengthening the weak and openly admitted dark sides of Civilization by the support of “higher Cultivation”.<sup>1</sup>

Without ever being committed to, or directly involved in, this debate, Crawford nevertheless contributed to it in a rather surprising manner, as it has recently been argued by D. Amagani. “On the Constitution of Church and State” contains a very long footnote in which Coleridge referred to Crawford’s “The History of the Indian Archipelago” (HIA) as “the work of a wise as well as an well-informed man”, and “it was no ordinary gratification to find, that in respect of certain prominent positions, maintained in this volume, I had unconsciously been fighting behind the shield of one whom I deem an honour to follow.”<sup>2</sup> In the extract from HIA quoted by Coleridge, Crawford explained how the existence of a fertile soil and a people exclusively devoted to agriculture in the tropical realms would naturally lead to the progress of absolute power, i.e. to the governmental mode of (Oriental) despotism. In the quotation, taken from the third volume of HIA, it was thus contended that: “For wherever [, in the east,] *agriculture* is the principal pursuit, there it may certainly be reckoned, that the people will be found living under an absolute government”.<sup>3</sup> Amagani has intriguingly analysed how Coleridge appropriated Crawford’s analysis and fitted it into his own ‘culture-orientated’ argument.<sup>4</sup> Crawford himself, to my best knowledge, never assigned the terms *culture* or *cultivation* with any meaning that even vaguely resembled Coleridge’s concept. On the contrary, he always maintained it firmly grounded in a materialist setting, within the general framework of civilization; from this foundation his causal mode of argumentation proceeded in a mechanistic fashion which offered a glaring contrast to Coleridge’s approach.<sup>5</sup> Yet, apparently this did not impede Coleridge’s appropriation of Crawford’s discourse. This instance of

---

<sup>1</sup> Mill 1836, pp.13, 14 & 25. It was in order to secure the “support of higher Cultivation” that J.S. Mill in this article strongly advocated immediate reforms of the English universities, which was a heated political topic in these years. In Sartori’s evaluation of J.S. Mill’s use of the term ‘culture’, this pointed to “the positive freedom that was at the core of the culture-concept”, and it “was being nested within a liberal conception of negative freedom.” (Sartori 2005, p.682 and Sartori 2008, p.30)

<sup>2</sup> Both quotations are from Coleridge 1830, pp.99.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Coleridge 1830, p.100 from HIA, Vol.III, p.24; my italics. The phrase “in the east” only figures in the original, whereas it has been left out in Coleridge’s text.

<sup>4</sup> Amagani, pp.48-56.

<sup>5</sup> All mentioning of “culture”, “cultivation”, “cultivate”, etc., which I have encountered in Crawford’s major publications before 1830, including HIA, refer exclusively to agricultural pursuits and seem not to be endowed with any further metaphorical meanings. In the 1860s Crawford also published a series of articles containing the term *cultivation* in their titles, but also in these cases it evidently referred to the cultivation of different types of plants and the importance of these for the progress of civilization. I have, however, stumbled upon the three following examples in some of his later texts: two of them are found in Vol.I of “A Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language”: the first refers to how “a few of these Philippine Negroes have submitted to the Spanish rule, and *undergone some degree of culture*” (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.clxiii-clxiv), and the second states that “the Malay of Amboyna, written in Roman letters, has, under the care of the Dutch, it is said, *received a large share of culture*”. (p.76) Here *culture* apparently referred to the refinement in either linguistic articulation or in the whole way of living which may follow as a result of receiving enlightened instruction from superior nations in terms of civilization. The other example is from Crawford 1869a: “The Malay language wants those evidences of *an ancient culture* which belong to the Javanese” (p.125; all the italics are mine). Here *culture* seems to possess the same meaning as the one used by Crawford’s companion in the Ethnological Society, E.B. Tylor.

“cultural bricolage” reflects not only the intertwined intellectual and political relationships between so remarkable and widely different individuals as the Romanticist poet S.T. Coleridge, the utilitarian philosopher J.S. Mill, and the Orientalist, ethnologist, and former scholar-administrator John Crawfurd, but it also accentuated the intimate linkages in the realms of British thought between, on the one hand, discussing contemporary British society and devising its future paths, and on the other theorizing on the non-European societies and on the colonial encounters which took place in this age between the post-Napoleonic period and the early Victorian era.<sup>1</sup>

### **1.3 From Civilization to Civilizations? Consistency and Change in Crawfurd's Texts.**

Whereas the notion of culture ever since Herder's conceptual coinage – with its emphasis on specific national destinies, the inherent spirit of the people, the uniqueness of the language, or the like – had been expressed, and analytically exploited, not solely in its singular but also in its plural quality as ‘cultures’,<sup>2</sup> civilization as a concept, on the other hand, maintained its universal character, and was only referred to in singular. “Civilization, like Man, was singular: the plural of the noun did not appear until the nineteenth century”.<sup>3</sup> It was, of course, acknowledged that even societies deemed to possess the same level of civilization evinced some obvious differences in their setup, but the analytical focus did not stray from the unifying factors which were deeply embedded in this approach; such differences were exactly of a *cultural* and not a *civilizational* nature. Thus, for instance, in the Scottish conjectural history the classification and ordering of the different societies were assessed through a set of criteria regarding rather abstract, societal aspects, such as the economical mode of subsistence, the production of tools and other material goods (the ‘arts’), the organization of society by its type of government and jurisprudence, as well as the structure, forms and range of its knowledge. Differences between the societies were assessed within a framework of fundamental sameness; they were thus attributed either to different levels of (the same kind of universal) civilization, or subsidiary they represented a surface phenomenon, manifesting themselves in contingent characteristics of taste and manner rather than affecting the essential aspects of society in its material composition and structural setup.

Where an approach through the idea of *culture* thus favoured an analysis of society which assessed each society in its own right, as an organic, self-sufficient entity, *civilization* as a concept prescribed a hierarchal and comparative approach based on certain, methodologically selected aspects of society. These selected aspects more often than not evinced an unmistakable positive bias towards the present Western, and especially British, society, in which these theories of civilization

---

<sup>1</sup> Amigoni p.33. For a similar way of approaching Britain and India as a “unitary field”, see Marriott, pp.221-222.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Williams 1988, p.89. See also Sartori 2005, pp.687-688.

<sup>3</sup> Stocking 1987, p.18.

had originated,<sup>1</sup> and as a consequence it posited these societies at the apex of the civilizational hierarchy. Still, these theories nevertheless *claimed* a universal validity. This was especially evident when civilization referred to the general process of progress; often, however, civilization was also applied to denominate a specific society, or group of societies, that had already reached a certain level of refinement; that is, they had attained civilization. In these instances it referred to the particular historical trajectory towards civilization which this society, or societies, had undergone. Hence, in this latter case, civilization was inoculated with a certain element of uniqueness, immanent in the always exceptional historical experience of any given society; this posed, if not a challenge then at least a complementary element to the universality of civilization. In the following I will endeavour to examine some of the tensions between the universal and the unique in Crawford's use of civilization as an analytical concept, such as these were articulated in an article from 1834 and with some digressions into both his earlier and his later work.<sup>2</sup> It should be noted here, though, that some of the references relied on in this analysis were sometimes more incidental than central to the argument in which they appeared. This, however, should not detract from its analytical value to us; on the contrary, if anything, it demonstrates how the concept of civilization continued to be crucial to Crawford's discourses, even when it was not in the forefront of them.

In a long article published in 1834 in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, Crawford both reviewed William Marsden's most recent work on Malay- and Polynesian linguistics, and he offered his own alternative interpretation. Of more interest here, however, is the global civilizational framework in which he inscribed the 'Oceanic region', a term which he admittedly had appropriated from French, and which comprised the 'Indian Archipelago', the Pacific, and Australia – although the latter was left out in the remaining part of the analysis.<sup>3</sup> In discussing the "origin of the different races" inhabiting the Oceanic region, Crawford moved on to discuss the civilizational aspects of this question, stating that: "*Civilization* seems to us to have *sprung up at particular favoured spots of our globe*, and to have been distributed by the race with which it originated".<sup>4</sup> After a presentation of the conditions necessary for the origin of civilization and the circumstances that facilitated its subsequent dissemination and propagation, and which primarily "consisted in *facility of intercourse*, but above all, in *identity of race*", the text offered a seemingly exhaustive enumeration of all the major instances of origin and dissemination of civilization around the world. Including the Oceanic

---

<sup>1</sup> Stocking thus emphasises that in Great Britain around 1830, "civilization often tended to imply a number of things that were more specific reflections of recent British experience: the factory system, and free trade; representative government and liberal political institutions; a middle-class standard of material comfort and the middle-class ethic of self-discipline and sexual restraint; and the Christian religion in its Protestant form". (Stocking 1987, pp.35-36)

<sup>2</sup> Here I will try to abstain from including the parts of Crawford's discourses that primarily deal with the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia; these will be analysed much more thoroughly in the forthcoming chapters and Parts.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1834a, pp.369-412; p.373. See part II for an analysis of the changes in Crawford's et al's definitions and uses of competing geographical terms designating Southeast Asia and the Pacific regions.

<sup>4</sup> This and the following quotations are all from Crawford 1834a, p.381. My italics.

region, civilization had allegedly originated in ten different zones of the world which were analysed in the following order:

- “The *Chinese type of civilization*”, which was comprised of societies belonging to “the same race or family”, and it “probably had its origin in the temperate and fertile valleys of the great rivers of China”. “The Chinese civilization, and its instrument, the Chinese language” had taken a particular path of civilization due to the impact of the “picture character of China” which had resulted in the dissemination of a single written language, a certain sign of civilization, but simultaneously it did not impede the existence of a multitude of spoken dialects:<sup>1</sup> the latter was normally perceived as an indication of a failure to reach the higher stages of civilization.<sup>2</sup>
- “The *Hindoo-Chinese countries*”, where “a *spontaneous and independent civilization* appears to have sprung up”; “one or other of the fertile valleys of the Camboja, Menam, or Irriwaddi, was most probably its seat”.<sup>3</sup>
- “*Hindustan* is another remarkable quarter, where a *spontaneous, early and dominant civilization* sprung up”. After having offered conjectures regarding the original seat of this civilization Crawford turned his attention towards its most distinguished attribute, viz. the Sanskrit language and its dissemination even to Europe “many ages before the era of history or even tradition”, a hypothesis which Crawford himself would later vehemently deny,<sup>4</sup> as well as its profound influence upon the more polished nations in the Indian Archipelago.<sup>5</sup> Although not stating it explicitly, Crawford apparently assumed that the location of origin of Sanskrit was to be located within India itself; within this context – which even today constitutes a heated topic in both academia and Indian political life – Crawford apparently subscribed to what T.R. Trautmann labels the “Indigenous Aryan View”.<sup>6</sup> Later Crawford suggested that in “Hindustan, civilization would seem to have sprung up at several distinct and independent points”;<sup>7</sup> although not

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.381-382. My italics.

<sup>2</sup> In a later article Crawford, who was from the Isle of Islay and spoke Scottish Gaelic fluently, stressed that: “Long after civilization has made advances on the plains, barbarism will linger in the mountains. In our own country, Wales and the Highlands of Scotland are examples, as are Brittany in France, and Galicia and the Asturias in Spain, in all of which rude languages still exist although *dying out, and, for the cause of civilization, deserving to die*” (Crawford 1861a, p.163. (My italics) In Crawford 1834a, p.388 a similar verdict was passed.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1834a, pp.382-383; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford here wrote that “from these again [i.e. the languages in Persia and Trans-Oxiana allegedly imbibed with Sanskrit], *in all human probability*, it [Sanskrit] was diffused by means of emigration and conquest, directly and indirectly, among all the languages of Europe, dead or living – an event which must have taken place long before the era of history or even tradition.” (p.384) Crawford’s later denial of the vast influence of Sanskrit, and indeed of the very existence of an Indo-European language family, will be discussed further in Part III and Part IV of this dissertation.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1834a, pp.383-384.

<sup>6</sup> “Introduction” in Trautmann 2005, pp.xiii-xliii. It should here be noted that this label is here used in relation to the conflicting interpretations of the archaeological sites of the so-called ‘Indus Civilization’ at Harappa and Mohenjo-daro which were not excavated before 1922-1923; that is, long after Crawford’s demise.

<sup>7</sup> In Crawford 1861a, p.165.

included in the 1834 article a congenial interpretation is asserted in his contemporary, but never published manuscript, a “Description of India”, written 1832-1833.<sup>1</sup>

- In *Central Asia*, “in the countries lying between Hindostan and the Caspian, and the Sea of Aral”, “we discover an independent civilization springing up” which is most renowned for having bred “the conquerors of Europe and Southern Asia in almost all ages”; furthermore, “it was by them in all probability that the Sanscrit language was disseminated in Europe, in ages far beyond the reach of history”.<sup>2</sup> In ascribing these people the role only as bearers, and not as the originators, of Sanskrit Crawford evidently differed from those who, like Sir William Jones, tended to locate the origin of Sanskrit to the people inhabiting either Persia or the Central Asiatic plains north of Persia.<sup>3</sup>
- “The *Semitic nations*” constitutes a “fifth focus from which an independent civilization emanated”; the “original seat was the countries watered by the Tigris and Euphrates”. The Arabic language had in this region played the same role as Sanskrit elsewhere, and it was contended that the “*extension* of this class of civilization is an affair of modern history”<sup>4</sup>. Remarkable in this context is the absence of any references to either the Scriptures, or to the ancient history, and assumed civilization, of the Holy Land.<sup>5</sup>
- On “the banks of the Nile, among the distinct race inhabiting *Egypt*”, a “peculiar civilization ... sprang up”; this civilization never extended substantially beyond its original borders.<sup>6</sup>
- In *Europe* “the distinguished civilization ... arose in Greece, in Etruria, and in Latium”.<sup>7</sup>
- “*Tibet* may be stated as another quarter where a *peculiar civilization* sprung up. This puny plant has scattered its seeds thinly over some of the most considerable of the nomade tribes of Tartary, as the Mongols and the Manchews, who have borrowed its alphabet, its literature, and the religion connected with them”.<sup>8</sup> It seems that the civilizational traits emphasised by Crawford in this context were quite similar to those which Coleridge would have said constituted *cultivation*, or culture, rather than they alluded to the concept of civilization per se.
- “In the *New World*, the only points in which civilization appeared were the genial climate, the open plains, and the fertile soil of the table lands of the Andes in the South, chiefly in Peru, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Although not phrased in unequivocal terms this nevertheless seems to be the general tenor of his analysis of the “Different Nations and Tribes”, Vol.I, pp.23-38 (and esp. pp.23-24). The manuscript in 2 vols. is located in British Library, India Office Library and Records, Private Papers, MSS EUR D457.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.384; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Trautmann 1997/2004, ch.2 offers a lucid analysis of Sir William Jones’ “ethnological project”, the theories it contained, and the metatheoretical foundation upon which it relied.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1834a, p. 384; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> As argued, for instance, in C.T. Beke’s “Origines Biblicae, or Researches in Primeval History” published the same year; see also Beke.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.385. My italics.

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.385.

<sup>8</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.385; my italics.

in the North, in Mexico”.<sup>1</sup> Any references to the cultural traits of this civilization are absent here, and instead the discourse is kept strictly within the confines of environmentalism: here Crawford unequivocally emphasized the natural over the more historical aspects of society.

- On the basis of this global assessment it was claimed that “it is *strictly analogous* to what had happened among the other races of mankind, to suppose that *an independent civilization had sprung up in some part of the Oceanic region*, from which it was spread to the other nations of the same race”.<sup>2</sup>

Although the term civilization does not appear anywhere in its plural form, it is nevertheless stressed in each of these cases that the origin of the civilization was spontaneous and independent; this amounted to arguing for an explicitly *polygenetic theory on the origin of civilization(s)* around the world. This implied that any civilizational essence shared by all these societies could not be attributable to a common historical legacy, whether known or not; instead it would have to be caused by the fact that they all belonged to Mankind, and thus were assumed partake in the same nature. But since Crawford apparently linked civilization with race,<sup>3</sup> even this assumption of a shared nature connecting all Mankind seemed debatable: each of these instances of independent civilization had putatively originated within a different race, and ‘interracial’ diffusion of civilization was deemed to pose, if not an insurmountable barrier, then at least it presented a much more serious obstacle than an ‘intra-racial’ dissemination of civilization.<sup>4</sup> Of course one should be wary with not exaggerating the insistence of essential difference ingrained in the idea of race at this period (1834),<sup>5</sup> and one ought not to imbue the term with the same, more well-defined meaning and derogative connotations which it obviously possesses for anyone living in the post-1945 era. Yet this correlation, and perhaps even causal relationship, between race and civilization suggested that a plurality of races would also imply a certain element of plurality in the idea of civilization. Given that each race experienced its own path towards civilization, the question, then, would be to what degree did these paths, mutadis mutandis, partake in the same trajectory? And on this question Crawford remained silent; all these societies were approached from- and assessed within the same

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1834a, p. 385; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1834a, p. 385; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Such as he clearly stated it various times in this article, e.g. on p.381. Furthermore, Crawford expressed, as will be discussed later, polygenetic views with regard to the origin of the different races, and as such he was, at least up to the 1850s, in opposition to the prevalent theories, such as these especially were enunciated by the most prominent British ethnologist during the first half of the nineteenth-century, J.C. Prichard whose theoretical approach was strictly monogenetic. Claiming that each race had a different origin did not, however, impede Crawford from championing the abolitionist cause. On Crawford’s polygenism, see e.g. Burrow 1966, pp.122-124; Stocking 1987, p.100; Livingstone 1992b, pp.28-29; Livingstone 2008, pp.112-114; Ellingson, p.268; Kidd 2003, p.882; and Kenny, p.376.

<sup>4</sup> As he includes Crawford in chapter 5 entitled “The limits of Diffusion: Science and Technology in the debate over the African and Asian Capacity for Acculturation”; on race and civilization. Adas, pp.300-305.

<sup>5</sup> N. Hudson has focused on “the changing meaning of the term “race”, along with the associated terms “nation” and “tribe”, from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment” (Hudson 1996, p.247).



unifying, analytical framework of *one* civilization, but the continued focus on independent origins and autonomous paths tempts one to conclude that we here have an analysis structured on an idea of *civilizations*, albeit this term never appears in the text.<sup>1</sup>

In his earlier appraisals of the characteristics and values of the civilizational traits of the Chinese, Crawford at times invoked such phrases as “the Chinese stamp of civilization”,<sup>2</sup> which indicated a specificity of this civilization, but still this was safely contained within the universalistic structure of civilization in its singular form. However, one of the sentences, in which this phrase formed a part, indicated a somewhat more unsettling alternative: “Excluding the nations of the Chinese stamp of civilization, *who have little in common with the rest of mankind*, civilization and genius decrease as we go eastward”.<sup>3</sup> That is, the nations associated with the “Chinese stamp of civilization” were not only special in the *appearance* of their form of civilization, but, more importantly, they seemed to be situated *beyond the spatiality of the prevalent civilizational trajectory*; furthermore, it seemed to be suggested that they somehow formed an independent branch of mankind. Throughout his entire career Crawford showed a particular penchant towards the Chinese people, if not necessarily towards the Chinese *state* which he saw as yet another instance of Oriental despotism.<sup>4</sup> He consistently asserted that, when compared to any other nation in Asia, the Chinese nation held “superior claims to civilization and improvement”,<sup>5</sup> and it “is universally admitted to be more civilized than any than any Asiatic nation, with the exception, perhaps, of Japan”.<sup>6</sup> But the abovementioned quotation appears to be the closest that he ever came to explicitly sounding the profundity of the assumed uniqueness of the Chinese civilization.

During the 1850s and 1860s Crawford would occasionally use the term *civilisations*,<sup>7</sup> but – at least in all the examples I have found in Crawford’s texts – it was safely inscribed into a unifying discourse, emphasising the common features rather than the differences. Indeed, anything like the globally encompassing list of autochthonous civilizations in the article from 1834 did not often occur in the prolific number of articles published by Crawford in these years.<sup>8</sup> However, the hypothesis of independent origins of the different civilizations was, doubtlessly, maintained along

---

<sup>1</sup> In principle, another solution would be solely to consider civilization as a purely *analytical tool*, a particular mode of approach to the field of the study of Man as a societal creature which then *constructs* its own subject area that does not necessarily have any correspondent quality in the analysed societies out in ‘the real world’. But there exists no positive evidence for ascribing such an approach to Crawford, or to any of his contemporaries.

<sup>2</sup> See HIA, Vol.III, p.205, and *Crawford 1828a*, p.590; in HIA, Vol.I, p.350 an almost identical phrase appears.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.205; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Although considered more enlightened and well-ordered than the rest of the instances of Oriental despotism, Crawford did not share some of the Enlightenment philosophers’ veneration towards the Chinese meritocratic system of governance; for more on this, see the chapter on “Oriental despotism” in Part II.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawford 1817a*, p.38.

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1818*, p.433.

<sup>7</sup> This term appeared 6 times in the entry on “Man” in *Crawford 1856* (pp.259-264), and once in the entry on “Romania Point” (p.369); in *Crawford 1869a* the term figured 8 times (pp.124, 126 [2], 127 [2], 130 & 133 [2])

<sup>8</sup> The conjectures upon the origins of civilizations around the entire globe in *Crawford 1868b* is an exception to this.

with the affiliated racial assumptions. Yet these theories were increasingly articulated within a strictly comparative framework, transgressing the boundaries of each society, or civilization, with its focus on universal similarities regarding the obtained stage of civilization and with this the prevalence of certain societal elements – ranging from numeric systems and types of written language, over the possession as well as production of stone and metal tools, to the cultivation and consumption of narcotic plants, etc..<sup>1</sup>

If not directly *defined* by these specific elements of society, civilization was, nonetheless, often *identified* by them; together with the fact that *race* was by now far more frequently attributed an explanative power as a primary cause for advancing, or perhaps rather inhibiting, civilization, this shift in focus from the, a priori defined, grand structures of society towards an increased interest in an array of more directly observable, and by now theoretically charged, elements of society constitutes, in my opinion, the most crucial change in Crawford's discourses during this period between conjectural history and burgeoning sciences of ethnology and anthropology. Beneath these observable, identificatory objects lurked an increasingly more elaborate theoretical framework, without which these objects could obviously not possess such an identificatory function. In 1861 Crawford articulated his probably most explicit statement of the meaning of civilization and its theoretical components:

“The *word civilization* is, of course, merely a relative term, and which, although it always *implies social advancement*, it is *impossible to fix or define*. A people, however, that *cultivates useful plants*, that has *domesticated some useful animals*, that possesses knowledge of some of the *useful metals*, that has acquired the art of *weaving textile fabrics*, and, finally, that has either invented for itself *written language* or borrowed and used that of another people, may, I think, be safely *called civilized*.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, despite initial claims of the opposite, Crawford still managed to formulate some minimum requirements for what was meant by civilization. These 5 requirements were based on criteria relating to subsistence economy, techniques and materials involved in production, and means of storing and communicating knowledge; as such they bear an evident resemblance to the analytical levels articulated within conjectural history. In this interpretation, the term civilization constituted a well defined ethnological, or anthropological, concept, and it would hardly make any sense to invoke this meaning of civilization, when using it in political discussions concerning contemporary British society – or regarding the major part of the relevant colonial sphere for that matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> This wide range of societal traits analysed within a framework of progressive civilization is reflected in the titles and the content of many of the articles published by Crawford in the TES during especially the 1860s.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1861a, p.159; my italics. This paper was originally read on April 20, 1859. (Ellingson, p.291)

Obviously, all of India, except for its remotest fringes, as well as most of Southeast Asia, complied with these requirements, and in this sense they were beyond doubt civilized. In this meaning of the concept, the notion of civilization was primarily involved in speculations on prehistoric times, or it was primarily concerned with the most primitive contemporary societies.

However, when reframed into a discussion regarding *degrees of civilization*, the concept still cogently influenced the political and public realms; and by now it had become equipped with the authority associated with a scientific discipline. Nowhere was this more evident than in the discussion of the scope, possibilities, and impediments with regard to the so-called “problem of moral progress”. That is, how could both the lower urban classes at home and the savage nations and races abroad<sup>1</sup> be improved upon through the benevolent – albeit sometimes, when need arose, also despotic – guidance of the civilizational (and, within this framework, hence also morally) superior forces.<sup>2</sup> In determining to what degree such a project was possible at all, and in devising the most apt means of executing it, different anthropological theories were invoked during the second half of the nineteenth-century.<sup>3</sup> In this manner they replaced the function earlier played by the developmentalist theories associated with the Scottish tradition, the Evangelical creed, or the Utilitarian schemes for improvement. By creating a common epistemological space – demarcated by the notion of civilization, or the Tylorian concept of culture, and characterized by the all-pervasive idea of progress – they played a vital role both at home and in the colonial setting.

---

<sup>1</sup> The race concept was frequently applied in an European setting; for instance, there was a long history of emphasising the Celtic → Anglo-Saxon divide on the British Isles in terms of racial difference, with the Celts presented either as noble representatives of original values, or, as was far more often the case, as reckless primitives (see e.g. *Stocking* 1987, pp.62-69 & 234); Crawford himself thus often draw analogies between primitive traits in Southeast Asian societies and Celtic traditions. For the issue of race within a bigger European context, see also *Jahoda*.

<sup>2</sup> *Stocking* 1987, pp.219-237; *Adas*, pp.271-342

<sup>3</sup> For an illuminating discussion of two such conflicting, anthropologically founded projects towards a “responsible” colonial administration of Fiji in the latter part of the nineteenth-century, see ch.4 in *Thomas* 1994.



## 2. Conjectural History, Colonial Engagements, and Crawford's Historiography.

Ideas of a dynamic civilization, encompassing all aspects of society, were, as already mentioned, rife in eighteenth-century British society, and although the desirability of this process was at times contested (especially within the debates concerning the debilitating effects of luxury)<sup>1</sup>, the trope of progress nevertheless proved to be the prevalent one. As argued by Spadafora, the progression-orientated approach was consolidated throughout the latter half of the century, where the influence of Biblically inspired notions of a continuous historical decline, or of the classic cyclical theories of history seemed to wane even more rapidly.<sup>2</sup> This process was buttressed by an unprecedented growth in accumulated wealth and production capacities, nowhere experienced more profoundly than in Great Britain. These trends opened up for a considerable interpretive scope within which this notion progress could be articulated and contextualized.<sup>3</sup> Thus, whereas most English literati who wrote on these matters opted for a divinely inspired, indefinite, and limitless progress, the Scottish tradition took a more secular path, and it produced a series of key texts all concerned with a more tangible brand of social evolution – dealing with how this was defined, how it had hitherto progressed, and how it could be secured to prosper in the immediate future as well.<sup>4</sup>

Both traditions were systematically integrated into British imperialism. The former in the shape of an expanding Anglican Church and an Evangelical spirit; this not only imbued missionaries but it also influenced politicians and colonial administrators decisively in the reactionary period following after the French Revolution. Indeed, it was so strong that it, according to C. Bayly, formed the dominant British creed during the zenith of the so-called “Imperial Meridian”, encompassing the era from c.1780-1830.<sup>5</sup>

The Scottish influence prospered particularly well, given that it constituted both a well-defined and easily applicable theory which was propagated overseas by the disproportionately great number of well-educated Scottish civil servants and military officers employed in the colonial service.<sup>6</sup> These two traditions, the English and the Scottish, sometimes converged, as probably most glaringly evinced in the case of the Scotsman and Evangelical, Charlie Grant, whose ideas had a

---

<sup>1</sup> This topic is discussed in *Spadafora*, pp.213-223 (England) and pp.276 & 296 (Scotland). See also *Wood*, p.106.

<sup>2</sup> *Spadafora*, e.g. pp.21-36.

<sup>3</sup> *Marriott*, p.9.

<sup>4</sup> See chapters 6 & 7 in *Spadafora*. It should be noted, though, that – with D. Hume as the prominent exception – most of these Scottish literati still opined that “the history of the species [of Mankind] illustrated the workings of Divine providence”, despite the fact that this divine power was altogether absent in their secularised discourses (*Wood*, p.102).

<sup>5</sup> See *Bayly* 1989, pp.136-147.

<sup>6</sup> In recent years the historiography of the Scottish participation in the British Imperialism, where they often constituted the vanguard in terms of ideology as well as manpower, has received much attention. See e.g. *Bayly* 1989, esp. pp.81-86; *Colley*; *Mackenzie*; and *Kidd* 2003, esp. pp.882-883.

great impact upon the British governance of India from 1796 and onwards.<sup>1</sup> In the end both shared the same goal: an intensified British dominance over its colonial territories and especially over India. This was *imagined* in the shape of a new colonial ‘governmentality’, to use Foucault’s term,<sup>2</sup> but they differed substantially in their mode of argument; this, again, influenced the formulation of the more immediate political goals as well as in the devising and implementation of the means employed to achieve these. However, whether this governmentality was implemented in reality is a moot point in modern historiography, and it needs not detain us here<sup>3</sup> – suffice just to say that Evangelicals, Utilitarians, and most Scottish conjectural historians<sup>4</sup> alike shared a similar vision on the desired colonial mode of governance, albeit they differed somewhat in their political rationale.

Crawfurd expressed himself exclusively within the secularised discourses of conjectural history, later perhaps blended with a certain element of Utilitarianism. I will, in the following, take a diachronic detour by first introducing the main characteristics of the Scottish conjectural history, such as it developed from the 1760s and onwards, followed by a discussion of some structural implications inherent in this approach, and how these continued to be relevant long after the disappearance of conjectural history per se; then Crawfurd will be assessed as a conjectural historian, seeing his major texts interpreted within this framework.

## **2.1 The Concept of Civilization within the ‘Scottish Tradition’.**

These theories of how the history of Man and society progressed, which later mostly became known as conjectural history, arose and were disseminated within the intellectual environments associated with the universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen; they blossomed in the eighteenth-century and had an instrumental importance in the Scottish Enlightenment. Apart from David Hume and Adam Smith, this period also produced such, perhaps less prominent but never insignificant, philosophers and historians as Francis Hutcheson, Thomas Reid, Henry Home (Ld. Kames), William Robertson, Adam Ferguson, John Millar, James Burnett (Ld. Monboddo), and finally Dugald Stewart – the latter who in many ways served as the last beacon and great synthesiser of this tradition. And, although today probably not known to many except the adepts of

---

<sup>1</sup> For an analysis of Grant’s key text and its reception in the Indian governance, see *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.101-117

<sup>2</sup> In broad terms D. Scott describes how “the formation of colonial modernity would have to appear as a discontinuity in the organization of colonial rule characterized by *the emergence of a distinctive political rationality* – that is, a *colonial governmentality* – in which power comes to be directed at the destruction and reconstruction of colonial space so as to produce not so much extractive-effects on colonial bodies as governing-effects on colonial conduct” (*Scott.*, p.204; my italics). See also *Cooper*, pp.113-149 for a longer discussion of ‘Modernity’ within a colonial context.

<sup>3</sup> For more on this debate, see the subchapter on historiography in the introduction. On a broader discussion on the importance, or lack of importance, of ideology within the British imperial context, see *Howe*.

<sup>4</sup> In the case of the Scottish conjectural historians who wrote extensively on the British Empire it was more muddled; although all sharing these goals many of them, as M. McLaren convincingly argued in the Indian case (by far the most important), had a pragmatic and common sense orientated approach in their capacities as scholar-administrators: in this they drew upon strands in the Scottish Enlightenment (cf. *Spadafora*, ch.7), upon Burke’s writings, and upon the more ‘traditional’ Orientalist (in the “Jonesian” sense) approach to Indian society. (*McLaren 2001*, esp. pp.137-143 & p.253)

eighteenth-century Scottish intellectual history, names like James Beattie, James Dunbar, and John Gregory also left their lasting mark upon the ideas that grew out of this period. Compared with the “sleepy dons” at Cambridge and Oxford,<sup>1</sup> the Scottish university system was marked by an undogmatic approach to religion and the inclusion of different types of students, as well as a remarkable dynamism both within and in between the different scholarly and scientific branches: nowhere was this more vividly illustrated than in the widely embracing and methodologically diverse discipline of moral philosophy.<sup>2</sup>

### 2.1.1 The Scottish Socio-cultural Contexts.

In the wake of the formal union with England in 1707 followed an array of processes of integration with the much richer and densely populated England, and these were intensified even further during the post-Culloden era. The most important element was an intensified integration into the economical systems of the British Atlantic world and after 1783 into Britain’s ‘Second Empire’; this was accompanied by parallel processes of integration and resistance in the social, political, and cultural fields as well.<sup>3</sup> In order to compensate for their relative backwardness, an array of societal reforms were conceived and implemented: among these the movement for *agrarian improvement* had a profound impact both at home and abroad. Modulated on its English equivalent and predecessor, it shared the same ulterior goal, viz. getting rid of all feudal, and other ancient, types of right to exploit the land, and instead to establish a fixed ownership to all land by embedding it firmly in the concept of private property;<sup>4</sup> thence it could be turned it yet into another transferable commodity in the free market which Adam Smith in these years underpinned with his elaborate theories. However, in its Scottish version the envisioned ideal of an agricultural system did not materialize in the shape of the English large-scale estates; on the contrary, it was based on smaller farms, owned by what was perceived as a frugal and enterprising yeoman class, much more bent on improvement and progress than a rich and absent landowner. Within the framework of conjectural history these ideas were turned into a historical theory of *progressive stages of society* defined by the modes of property rights to land; as such they influenced the ways in which Scottish scholar-administrators approached and conceptualized the Indian society they were sent out to rule. Later they served as bearing marks when political strategies were devised and administrative obligations effectuated. Hence they had both profound epistemological and ideological implications.

---

<sup>1</sup> I have borrowed this phrase from R. Irwin who used to describe the both relative and absolute decay of these institutions of learning during the 18<sup>th</sup> C. (Irwin 2006, pp.117-122).

<sup>2</sup> See Spadafora ch.7 and Collini, Winch, & Burrow, pp.45-50 (on the general situation); Wood, pp.94-96 (on the structure of curricula in Aberdeen); McLaren 2001, esp. pp.24-27 & 65-66 and Rendall pp.45-51 (On the experiences of future Scottish Orientalists).

<sup>3</sup> Bayly 1989, pp.81-82.

<sup>4</sup> Bayly 1989, pp.85-86 & 155-160.

On the basis of this rationale Munro conceived and outlined, if not outright invented,<sup>1</sup> the Roytwari system which – with its emphasis on small estates administered by the individual who cultivated the land himself – was seen as a decisive step forward in the progressive state of Indian civilization. Indeed, Munro explicitly compared the situation with what was seen as historical precedents in Scotland, and thus the zamindari-, poligar-, and mirasi rights became equated with, by now, obsolete Scottish systems of ownership.<sup>2</sup> Among the Scottish scholar-administrators this seemed to be a characteristic approach;<sup>3</sup> Crawford, however, seemed to deviate from this with his apparent preference towards the zamindari system and to what could be interpreted as its correspondent within the Javanese society.<sup>4</sup>

Empire had an integrative effect too. It was not only through a common identification as “Britons”, when faced with either with European enemies or extra-European colonial subjects rather than just as English, Scottish, Welsh, etc., such as L. Colley has argued;<sup>5</sup> a more direct influence was provided through the manners in which the overseas networks became ever more entangled. A disproportionately large number of Scotsmen thus participated in the colonial enterprise thanks to a mixture of lack of proper career opportunities at home, a high level of education obtained at the Scottish universities, and a relative good network of patronage in London.<sup>6</sup>

The period also saw the development of distinct forms of Scottishness as a national identity; it took its form in an ongoing dialectics between notions of what it meant to be of English, Anglo-Saxon, Teutonic, or Celtic origin. It was never a uniform process characterized by the establishment of one national myth which was facilitated by- and then buttressed the burgeoning nation-state, such as it increasingly happened on the continent during the first half of the nineteenth-century. As part of a larger, “multi-nation” state formation (and furthermore internally divided) the Scottish Lowlanders, constituting by far the most influential part of the country, did not only distinguish themselves in terms of identity from their English neighbours south of the border; even more persistent was the insistence on an essential difference between them and the Celtic inhabitants of the Highlands and the islands in the Irish Sea. This ‘Celtic fringe’<sup>7</sup> served as a negative demarcator between themselves and the Celts who were not considered more original Scottish but rather more primitive, and at times even regarded as irretrievably pinned down in a quickly disappearing past.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the elements of *reconstructivism* and *constructivism* in Munro’s system see McLaren 2001, pp.204,205 & 207-208.

<sup>2</sup> This aspect is thoroughly analysed in McLaren 2001, pp.192-212.

<sup>3</sup> See McLaren, and Bayly 1989, pp.155-157.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Bastin 1954, esp. pp.36-39 & 137-141, and Quilty 2001, esp. pp.282-302.

<sup>5</sup> Colley, p.316.

<sup>6</sup> McLaren stressed that this patronage in itself was not sufficient to secure them a prosperous Indian career, if they were not more skilful than their better connected English peers too, but often it was enough to provide them with the opportunity to at least prove themselves out there; thanks to Henry Dundas’s “inexhaustible wells of patronage” many a late 18<sup>th</sup> C. Scotsman was better connected than people from other parts of the British periphery. (Bayly 1989, p.84)

<sup>7</sup> On the use of this concept, both then and in later historiography, see Kidd 2003, pp.874-876.



During the first half of the nineteenth-century the defining criteria for this difference became ever more racialized,<sup>1</sup> and in this process the (otherwise linguistically inclined) ethnologist J.C. Prichard played a pivotal role. Although from the onset acknowledging that the Celtic language belonged to the Indo-European branch, he insisted already in the 1.ed. of “Researches in the Physical History of Man” from 1813 on a clear physical difference between the Germanic people and the Celts; this was evinced in the latter’s darker complexion and the fact that “their feature differ considerably from those of the German race, being smaller in general and not so well formed”.<sup>2</sup> These theories were elaborated in the later, much enlarged versions of this text, and not at least in “The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations” from 1831.<sup>3</sup> Prichard had also sent some excavated body remains of alleged Celtic origin to the Swedish anatomist A. Retzius who later incorporated them into his theory on the successive stages of early European history, a theory based on racial premises and a strict craniological criterion. Later these theories were re-exported to Great Britain and relied on by, among others, Prichard himself.<sup>4</sup> These theories stated explicitly that the Celtic people were among the earliest<sup>5</sup> inhabitants of Europe, and later they had been displaced to its fringes by the racially and civilizationally superior Germanic race. Although Crawford’s approaches in most aspects were almost antithetical to those of the Quaker and strictly monogenetic Prichard, as it will be discussed in especially part IV, he did not differ much in his evaluation of the obtained level and quality of the Celtic civilization. Allusions to the Celtic past were sometimes made by Crawford as a part of an *analogical reasoning*, when establishing either the relative or the absolute level of civilization amongst foreign societies in e.g. the Indian Archipelago; in this way the exotic unknown was familiarized to the readers through the comparison with the literary commonplace of Celtic primitiveness. In his review of Raffles’s “History of Java”, published in the Edinburgh Review in 1819, Crawford thus characterized the relationship between the Javanese on the one hand and the Sunda and Madurese languages on the other in the following manner: “the two last are *very rude and uncultivated languages*, and bear to the Javanese, in many respects, the same relation that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Kidd 2003, p.878. As such they were in tune with the mainstream scientific mainstream of the day; this theme will be examined in a later chapter (3) with a focus on the development in Crawford’s use of the concept.

<sup>2</sup> Prichard 1813, p.535.

<sup>3</sup> On this, see Stocking 1973, pp.ix-cxlv, pp.lxxiii-lxxiv. And Augstein 1999, esp. ch.6-7.

<sup>4</sup> The detail and implications of interesting aspect has recently been analyzed by P. Rowly-Conwy; see Rowly-Conwy, esp. pp.60-65 & 89-99. See also Stocking 1987, pp.65-66.

<sup>5</sup> According to these theories they were, however, preceded in Europe by the Basques and the Lapps. This inference was based in the following evidence, viz. that these people occupied very remote corners of Europe too, that their languages were of non-Indo-European origin, and, most importantly, the (idealized) measures of their cranial data demonstrated them to belong to the people characterized by the broad-faced form, which showed them to resemble more the Asiatic, so-called Turanian-speaking people than the Indo-Europeans. On this basis they were deemed to be even more primitive than the Celts who, nevertheless, in their earliest history were assumed to have intermingled with these and hence acquired many of their primitive, non-Indo-European characteristics. Rowly-Conwy, pp.93-97.

Celtic languages of Britain do to the English”.<sup>1</sup> Given that a society’s *linguistic stage* made up a quintessential criterion in the determination of the general stage of civilization,<sup>2</sup> a “very rude and uncultivated language” would, *ceteris paribus*, reflect a very rude and uncultivated society as well. The Celtic civilization, in sum, provided an obstacle to general progress, and Crawford stated in 1834 that in “France, and in the British islands, the *rude Celtic* [language], *to the great benefit of society, is in gradual progress of extinction*, and even the Anglo-Saxon dialect of the Scotch is rapidly giving way to the more polished and useful English”.<sup>3</sup> And this was despite his later admission of being a native speaker of these languages himself – that “Gaelic was the language of my childhood (I still retain some colloquial acquaintance with it).”<sup>4</sup>

In relation to the English, the Lowlanders did not assert their identity in terms of ethnic distance, but rather by claiming to represent an even purer stock of Englishness than the English themselves.<sup>5</sup> In contrast to the dissociation from the Celts, which in its ‘scientific’ version<sup>6</sup> relied heavily on events assumed to have happened during the earliest (pre)history of Europe, the historical rationale for claiming to represent the purest Englishness relied mainly on interpretations of post-Roman and medieval history. Either they perceived themselves as purer descendants of the Anglo-Saxons than the English who, apart from the Norman invasion, generally had intermixed much more with the continent than they had; or, instead of descending from the Anglo-Saxons, their bloodline were traced to the Vikings, who were presumed to be the purest representatives of the Teutonic race, and in this case they situated their history within a Norse context.<sup>7</sup> The Scandinavian link appeared in its most radical form in a text by John Pinkerton from 1787, where it was argued that the Picts, the oldest recorded inhabitants of Scotland, were of Scandinavian origin. As argued by Rowly-Conwy, there existed tight intellectual links and personal ties between Scotland and Scandinavia within the

---

<sup>1</sup> P.403 in *Crawford 1819*. In HIA vol.II, p.17 the literature of present Javanese society was compared to the civilizational level achieved by Homeric Greece and the Caledonians in the time of Ossian (although this did *not* necessarily imply that they could be equated with these aesthetically!) – the latter referring to J. McPherson’s famous hoax. In HIA vol.I, p.339 musical instruments of the Indian Archipelago was compared with, among others, Scottish and Irish, and this was repeated almost verbatim in *Crawford 1856*, p.179. In *Crawford 1867c*, p.206, the civilization of the “ancient Britons, or the ancient Irish, or both” was attributed the same level as that presently achieved by the Malays and the Philippine Islanders.

<sup>2</sup> This very important aspect will be much more thoroughly analyzed in especially Part III of the dissertation.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawford 1834a*, p.388.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1866b*, p.71.

<sup>5</sup> *Kidd 2003*, e.g. p.877, *Colley*, pp.314-315.

<sup>6</sup> In the 18<sup>th</sup> C. this Highland-Lowland divide was also closely connected with the political-dynastical realm in the shape of support to the Stuart cause. (*Colley*, p320) In the case of Ireland, and similarly with the many Irish who immigrated to Scotland in the 19<sup>th</sup> C., the Celtic identity was furthermore associated with Catholicism (*Kidd 2003*, pp.883-884) – the traditional Other in modern British history. See also *Koditschek 2011*, pp.17-55 on the ideological integration of Scotland into an imperial British realm and an ensued cultural merging between the two, still markedly different, identities.

<sup>7</sup> *Kidd 2003*, pp.877-882 & 885-892.

realms of history and the burgeoning archaeological researches during the first half of the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

### 2.1.2 Framing Conjectural History.

The particular approach to history which Dugald Stewart in the 1790s was to denominate conjectural history seems to have integrated two different philosophical tendencies of the time. One of these was an Anglo-Saxon inclination towards historicising the epistemological question of how Man could access and assess the outside world and the internal one; the other consisted in a growing desire for delineating the earliest history of Mankind without (solely) relying on the content of the Holy Scriptures and other traditionally assumed authoritative, written sources. Despite the fact that reconstructions of the universal history of Man based solely on imaginative readings of these Holy and/or ancient texts were still vividly pursued – with the influential chronology of Bishop Usher<sup>2</sup> and Newton's chronological exercises among the more famous instantiations hereof<sup>3</sup> – the idea of the 'state of nature', presupposed in the ideas on Natural Law and in the contractual theories, begged for new approaches.<sup>4</sup> The fundamental premises ingrained in this idea a priori precluded any recourse to written source-material, whether sacred or secular, as giving an authentic description of these alleged pre-societal times within a state of nature, when this was considered to constitute a (pre)historical stage that actually had existed; instead *other kinds of source-material* had to be relied on as supplying *reliable evidence* on the conditions of the 'state of nature', and with these arrived *new modes of inference*. These were provided by a combination of philosophical reasoning on human nature and observations of people discovered in the New world, and later in the South Seas, New Holland, etc, who were presumed to represent the kind of existence closest to this scientifico-mythical state of nature.<sup>5</sup>

Following in the tradition of such diverse thinkers as José Acosta and Samuel Pufendorf,<sup>6</sup> French eighteenth-century philosophers developed this approach even further, and although Spadafora emphasises that some of the British doctrines of general progress actually antedated the

---

<sup>1</sup> Rowly-Conwy, esp. pp.138-152. See also Aarsleff 1967/1983, pp.163-164.

<sup>2</sup> On the importance of his chronology in subsequent British historiography and historicised natural sciences, see e.g. Glacken, p.407; Trautmann 1992, pp.385-389; Trautmann, 1997/2004, pp.57-59 & 193.

<sup>3</sup> On Newton's chronologies, see, McGrane, pp.55-64. Other prominent and important British publications on chronology from the 18<sup>th</sup> C. are e.g. R. Jones' "Origin of the Languages and Nations, Hieroglyphically, Etymologically, and Topographically defined and Fixed" (1764), and Jacob Bryant's "A New System, Or, an Analysis of Antient Mythology", 6 vols. (1774-1776). Another British 18<sup>th</sup> C. publication structured on this approach was the voluminous "Universal History", of which 65 vols. were published between 1747 and 1765. On this, see Marshall & Williams, p52; Griggs, pp.228-237.

<sup>4</sup> For more on this topic, see also, Sebastiani 2001.

<sup>5</sup> The best and most thorough treatment of the integration of the vastly expanding genre of travel literature into the European philosophy and historiography in this context is still Marshall & Williams.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Høiris 2001b and Palmeri.

most important of the French theories,<sup>1</sup> it is beyond doubt that the French Philosophes influenced their Scottish contemporaries and successors profoundly. From Turgot they derived much of the inspiration to devising the stadial theories on the progression of Mankind,<sup>2</sup> while Montesquieu doubtlessly proved to be an invaluable source of inspiration, both in terms of the general approach, and, as it is probably better known, through his environmentalist theories.<sup>3</sup> Although they did not draw the same moral conclusions as Rousseau did – with his ideas on the earliest construction and changes of society, and the subsequent establishment of inequality as a fundamental trait of developed societies – Rousseau still provided the Scottish literati with a model of how to frame their reasoning on Mankind’s earliest history within a trope of progression. With the partial exception of Ferguson, the Scots did not, however, follow Rousseau in situating the happiest moment in history within the earliest period of organized society.<sup>4</sup> Instead they situated it either in the present or in the future;<sup>5</sup> this resulted in a predominantly optimistic interpretation of societal progress. With the Philosophes they shared basically the same field of study, an analogous approach and subject area, but methodologically they were rather sceptic towards a too stringently mechanical mode of explanation, notwithstanding whether this was expressed in terms of the mechanical explanation of Man’s mental faculties,<sup>6</sup> or in the shape of an all-determining environmentalism.<sup>7</sup>

Acknowledging the heterogeneous setup of this group of Scottish philosophers and historians,<sup>8</sup> I here venture the risk of being accused of carrying out a too sweeping synthesis, by claiming that they nevertheless all seem to, by and large, have partaken in a shared tradition; common to all of these was that morality had “become an historical as well as a normative science”.<sup>9</sup> This did not imply that they uncritically conflated the normative ‘ought’ with the descriptive ‘is’; yet most of them did not carry this problem to the same sceptical limits as Hume did.<sup>10</sup> Instead they strove to

---

<sup>1</sup> Spadafora, p.228.

<sup>2</sup> Stocking 1987, pp.14-15. See also Lifschitz.

<sup>3</sup> H. Trevor-Roper identified Montesquieu as *the* most important inspiration for the Scottish Enlightenment ideas on Man and society (in *The Scottish Enlightenment*). See also Spadafora, p.266. On Montesquieu’s environmentalism, see Glacken, pp.565-587; and of course De l’Esprit des Lois itself, esp. Part III, Books 14-17.

<sup>4</sup> And *not*, as often stated, in the savage state, before society existed at all; this seems also to be how at least T. Reid interpreted Rousseau, and afterward construed his response according to this perception. (Wood, pp.108-111 & p.121)

<sup>5</sup> On the arguments for Rousseau’s importance for the Scottish enlightenment and his reception, see Wood, pp.104-111. The determination of ‘happiest’ historical period depended on the defining criteria for happiness and especially on society’s possibilities for meeting and countering the maladies which were by all acknowledged as inherent in the progress. On Ferguson’s analysis of these aspects, see Part I, Sections vii-x, pp.59-108 in the 1. ed. of *Ferguson*.

<sup>6</sup> For an interesting interpretation of this aspect with particular emphasis on the “Aberdeen School”, Wood, pp.90-99.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. *Ferguson*, pp.161-180 (Part III, Section i).

<sup>8</sup> Spadafora on how, although all acquainted with each other, “they hardly formed a homogeneous group” (p.262); yet “although the views of literati on the progress of human culture are hardly monolithic, the similarities in them far outweigh the differences”. (p.254) Wood, on the other hand, stresses the differences rather than the similarities (p.113).

<sup>9</sup> Wood, p.112.

<sup>10</sup> See e.g. Spadafora, p.262.

posit the foundations of moral philosophy within the secure Newtonian sphere of natural science.<sup>1</sup> Drawing on Bacon they tended to join civil- and natural history within the same field of study under the auspices a scientific methodology, and hence civil history could, and indeed should, be assessed most adequately within a nomothetic approach. From Locke they inherited an acute awareness of the problem of how to explain the processes in which sensory based perceptions were transformed into knowledge of the external world. The answer came in the shape of a temporalized epistemology, where such complex entities as the formation of ideas and the structure of language<sup>2</sup> were explained as evolving progressively within a ‘history of the mind’, during which Man’s intellectual faculties gradually developed. This history of the mind was construed on the basis of a set premises on Man’s innate nature, on reasoned conjectures from these (rather than on logical inferences), and on comparisons gathered from information on different societies scattered around the world.<sup>3</sup> With Hume’s ultrasceptical destabilization of any possibility of a secure, introspective epistemology,<sup>4</sup> the least flawed approach to the topic of moral philosophy seemed to be through the history of the mind,<sup>5</sup> and – given Man’s nature was always manifested in a societal setting, that “Man is, by nature, a member of a community”<sup>6</sup> – society constituted the medium in which both the history of the mind and the moral senses evolved in a conjuncture which could be labelled as *civilization*.<sup>7</sup> This implied that moral philosophy in Hume’s terms became synonymous with “the science of human nature”, and this could be revealed through a systemized study of what was considered to constitute society’s fundamental elements, viz. “law and government, political and social structure, language and the history of civilization in general”.<sup>8</sup> The specific structure of each society also influenced the modes of formation and expression of these moral faculties, according to

---

<sup>1</sup> Both Spadafora and Wood stressed the utmost importance of this desire for emulating the procedures and methodologies of natural science within moral philosophy as a means to gain a secure foundation from where authoritative theories could be produced; in presenting this argument both posited themselves in explicit opposition to the co-called ‘civic tradition’, represented by J.G.A. Pocock and in casu especially N. Phillipson, who tended to ascribe only a peripheral place to the natural sciences in the Scottish enlightenment; instead they focussed more on the contemporary political sphere as the most important context for the conceptualization of these theories in moral philosophy (Spadafora, e.g. pp.254, 265, & 423, and Wood, pp.112-115).

<sup>2</sup> Aarsleff argued very convincingly for perceiving Locke as the informative key figure (together with, and opposed to the School of Port Royal’s universal grammar) in European 18<sup>th</sup> C. linguistic philosophy and theory (Aarsleff 1967/1983, esp. ch.1-2); this position was reiterated in his scathing critique of Chomsky’s linguistic theories, see Aarsleff 1970, esp. pp.576-578 & 581-584.

<sup>3</sup> On this, see Paxman 1995 and Paxman 1993.

<sup>4</sup> This conceptual linkage has been brought to my attention by Spadafora (p.263, and also pp.141-145).

<sup>5</sup> For an informed analysis of the connection between the essentialist idea of ‘human nature’ and the, at least in theory, empirically founded notion of the ‘human mind’, see Poovey, pp.223-224.

<sup>6</sup> Ferguson, p.85.

<sup>7</sup> Which meant that they did not acknowledge the ‘state of nature’ as a historical entity, if ‘state of nature’ entailed an a priori exclusion of the societal state. Most famous is Hume’s emphasis of society as an inescapable conceptual framework for the historian, outside which human history cannot be assessed; and this implied that “the “state of nature”, which supposedly preceded society, is here “a mere philosophical fiction, which never had, and never cou’d have any reality” (Poovey, p.232). (Quotations are from Hume’s “A Treatise of Human Nature”).

<sup>8</sup> Spadafora, p.265.

the manner in which the epistemological and societal setup was framed; this manifested itself in the particular *mores* that characterized each society and gave it its unique brand of civilization. And reversely, the formation of each society was also not only influenced, but to a large degree determined by the accomplished civilizational level, or stage, that had been reached. It was without doubt this latter field that received most attention within the universalist and uniformitarian approach with its focus on the common traits ingrained in the shared nature of Man.

This synthesising narrative of the formation of-, and rationale behind, the Scottish blend of moral philosophy, natural history, and civil history has undoubtedly a retrospective tinge to it, and it is far from certain that the Scottish eighteenth-century philosophers and historians themselves would have subscribed to this interpretation. It is this fact that moved Wood to question the legitimacy of the “notion of a ‘Scottish School’ of historians uniformly employing the same analytical style”.<sup>1</sup> However, this notion of “a ‘Scottish School’ of historians” comprised by the likes of Hume, Robertson, Smith, Ferguson, Millar, and Kames carries a long history with it: it was first enunciated by Dugald Stewart in either 1790 or 1793,<sup>2</sup> when he, in his lectures on moral philosophy at Edinburgh, grouped them together and described their common methodological approach with the term conjectural history. Later these views were published in Stewart’s biographical essay on Adam Smith where he stated that: “to this species of philosophical investigation, which has no appropriate name in our language, I shall take the liberty of giving the title of *theoretical* or *conjectural history*; an expression which coincides pretty nearly in its meaning with that of *natural history*, as employed by Mr. Hume, and with what some French writers have called *histoire raisonnée*”.<sup>3</sup> With the term conjectural history Stewart emphasised how “*in want of evidence, we are under a necessity of supplying the place of fact by conjecture*; and when we are unable to ascertain how men actually conducted themselves upon particular occasions, of considering in what manner they are likely to have proceeded, from *the principles of their nature*, and the *circumstances of their external situation*”.<sup>4</sup> Stewart’s assertion referred particularly to the mode of inference employed in Adam Smith’s essay “Considerations concerning the First Formation of Languages”, originally attached to his “The Theory of Moral Sentiments”. Bearing this in mind, Wood argued that it is “misconceived to take Stewart’s notion, which was articulated with reference to a very specific genre of history, and apply it without qualification to the historical writings of the Scottish literati more generally”;<sup>5</sup> as further evidence of Stewart’s misconception of his immediate predecessors Wood stressed how e.g. Ferguson was very disinclined to “go beyond the evidence of

---

<sup>1</sup> Wood, p.113.

<sup>2</sup> The first year is according to Poovey (p.219), while the second is mentioned in *Stocking 1987*, p.31.

<sup>3</sup> Here quoted from *Stewart*, p.liii. The italics are Stewart’s own.

<sup>4</sup> *Stewart 1795*, p.lii. My italics.

<sup>5</sup> Wood, p. 115.

the historical record”, and apply “the type of hypothetical reasoning advocated by Stewart, and insisted that the methodological standards of natural history be upheld”.<sup>1</sup> But neither did Stewart seem to endorse ‘conjecture’ in the sense of unfounded speculation: rather, the conjectures had to be based on fixed premises regarding the (putative) universal nature of Man, as well as the specific “circumstances of their [the analysed societal entity] external situation”, such as comprised by environment, geography, the presence of the neighbouring societies, etc.

However, even if Wood was right in claiming that conjectural history, such as it was coined by Stewart, is *not* an apt term to describe the historical texts produced in late eighteenth-century Scotland, he still disregards the fact that Stewart’s use of this term was well embraced by contemporary society, and as such it has experienced a cogent history of reception, whether deserved or not. It was applied extensively by Dugald Stewart’s former students, and by those otherwise influenced by him. “If it is the fate of teachers to live on through their students, fortune was kinder to Stewart than to most of his breed”, D. Winch wrote, and he continued: “the list of those who attended his separate course [on politics and political economy] is an impressive one, including as it does the names of several men who were to achieve prominence in public life”.<sup>2</sup> This would certainly not be the first occasion where an ill conceived concept has proved to be trenchant and in the course of time has attained a fixed meaning, and thereby establishing its own field of study: a field relying on the authority gained from the tradition created through its commonly accepted construed history, notwithstanding whether this ultimately was invented or not.

It is exactly this aspect of conjectural history which will be assessed in the following; simply because it was through Stewart that Crawford and (most of) his contemporaries approached this tradition. It was as such that conjectural history helped to frame historical analyses on the progress of society as well as on the elements that could arrest it; it was within this rationale they devised the political strategies on how to avoid or overcome such arresting obstacles; and lastly, it served as a conceptual predecessor to the later anthropological theories of socio-evolutionism.

## **2.2 Delineating Conjectural History’s Time and Space.**

A number of preconditions and premises were ingrained in conjectural history; it was through these that the ‘scientifically’ based assessment of the past without recourse to written sources became possible, when such were either absent or not deemed reliable. This approach, with its focus on the unplanned development of the whole of society and the organic interrelatedness of its respective components,<sup>3</sup> opened a hitherto untilled field of the universal history of societal

---

<sup>1</sup> Wood, p.114.

<sup>2</sup> In Collini, Winch, & Burrow, p.44.

<sup>3</sup> Palmeri, p.1.

institutions and ideas. Rather than narrating the history of political events, its subject area was orientated towards structural change over time. Furthermore, it *could* also provide a general historical theory explaining the unfolding progress of society carrying in its wake a set of normative connotations, *if* the structuring aspects of conjectural history were ascribed an epistemological primacy over other, more traditional modes of historical inferences. In the following I will look into conjectural history's relation to some other modes of historiography and into its own major subject areas, I will sketch its spatio-temporal configurations, and finally through a representative example illustrate its modes of inference.

### 2.2.1 Delineating the Dynamics between History's Subject Areas.

When the polygenetic idiosyncrasies of Pinkerton and Ld. Kames are exempted,<sup>1</sup> the philosophers and historians of the Scottish Enlightenment abided by a strict monogenetic theory regarding the origin of man.<sup>2</sup> This shared origin accounted for the fundamental sameness innate in mankind and manifested most clearly at the earliest stages of its existence, before the traditions embedded in the particular history of each society left their individuating marks on the more progressed societies. In principle, this approach prescribed a quite unilinear progression in the history of mankind whose members all were subjected to the same a set of universally valid laws.<sup>3</sup> This, then, implied that all societies would have to experience the same *process* of progressive historical stages, albeit the chain of historical *events* would obviously differ from society to society.

But, as Hopfl aptly pointed out, it should be emphasised that the historical process thus envisaged was ascribed an *ideal* rather than a *real* ontological position: "the subject of conjectural history is not this or that society, or (still less) the human race, but the *typical* 'society', 'nation', or 'people'".<sup>4</sup> Thus in describing more detailed what he meant by conjectural history Stewart stated:

"In examining the history of mankind, as well as in examining the phenomena of the material world, when we cannot trace the process by which an event *has been* produced, it is often of importance to be able to show how *it may have been* produced by natural causes. Thus, in the instance which has suggested these remarks [Smith's essay concerning the first formation of languages] although it is impossible to determine with certainty what the steps were by which any particular language was formed, yet if we can show, from the known principle of humane nature, how all its various parts might gradually have arisen, the mind is not only to a certain degree satisfied, but a check is given to that indolent philosophy,

<sup>1</sup> Sebastiani 2003, pp.1-14. See also Livingstone 1992b, pp.13-16, and the remarks on Kames in Marshall & Williams.

<sup>2</sup> Stocking 1987, pp.18-19.

<sup>3</sup> This was the standard notion amongst the Scottish Enlightenment thinkers, although "there is no necessary connection between [the Scottish] conjectural history and the idea of the whole past as composing one continuity, and a continuity, what is more, of unilinear progress". (Hopfl, p.24)

<sup>4</sup> Hopfl, p.25; see also p.23, Stocking 1987, p.16, and Poovey, p.227.



which refers to a miracle, whatever appearances, both in the natural and the moral worlds, it is unable to explain.”<sup>1</sup>

Conjectural history was thus primarily intended to delineate the earliest times, when the initial, tender steps towards civilization were taken in the shape of “the origin of different sciences and of the different arts”, “the astonishing fabric of political union; the fundamental principles which are common to all governments; and the different forms which civilized society has assumed in different ages of the world”.<sup>2</sup> But these methodologies could be applied to classify and explain later historical periods too. Hence the sequential history of events, as encapsulated in the historical narration and derived from (preferably reliable) written sources, could, at least to a certain extent, at the same time both differ from and be co-existent with a conjectural history dealing with the same societies without giving rise to any undue epistemological discrepancy;<sup>3</sup> the huge gap between their explanatory modes, methodological approaches, and the divergence in the nature of the adequate source-material implied that the event-based historical narrative and the process-orientated conjectural history often constituted two parallel, rather than overlapping, explanatory structures on the same historical subject. The same happened, *mutatis mutandis*, with the other authoritative historical modes of inference and their associated genres of religiously imbued providential history, Biblical genealogy, or ancient history and chronology, as well as with the more loosely knitted antiquarianism. Ferguson, as already mentioned, preferred, like most of his contemporaries, to use traditional written source-material, whenever they were available, and on the basis of such material to produce a historical narrative.<sup>4</sup> This narrative, however, often tended to be structured in accordance with the stadial dynamism of conjectural history, and the primary focus would be on the topics that were privileged within its stadial approach.

In the context of the Asian societies and their history, the tension ingrained in such a ‘historiographical parallelism’ could become acute: often there existed indigenous written source-material in abundance, and these were collected, translated, edited, and invoked as part of the Orientalistic enterprise that was accelerated after Sir William Jones’s arrival to the Bengal; despite this, as Crawford’s case later will illustrate, they did not always regard the historical content of these sources as credible, and hence they reverted to the familiar and trusted methodologies of conjectural history.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stewart*, pp.lii-liii. The italics are Stewart’s.

<sup>2</sup> *Stewart*, pp.li-lii.

<sup>3</sup> *Palmeri*, p.3.

<sup>4</sup> See also *Hopfl*, p.32: “with the inventors of the method [conjectural history] a comprehensive and almost encyclopaedic knowledge of ancient history and literature, along with an abiding love of the classics and a fascination with anthropology, came *before* the ordering of that knowledge by means of conjectural history”.

Given the normative aspect embedded in conjectural history, a discrepancy *within* the ontological realm of conjectural history – that is, between 1) the prescribed “ideal-typical” process of progression and 2) the actually observed, or otherwise ascertained, structures of the society in question – would, however, be in need of an explanation: how come that the actual state of the society in question did not resemble the characteristics of the given level of civilization prescribed in conjectural history, and what could have caused such a deviance? In this way, the framework of conjectural history provided Crawford and his peers with a structured approach to the history of the Indian Archipelago that determined which questions were deemed pertinent and which were not.

The historical process prescribed by conjectural history on its march from rudeness to refinement was divided into different stages according to various criteria. Among these the four stage model became the most influential, especially in A. Smith’s version.<sup>1</sup> Although emphasising the interrelatedness of the different aspects of society, the defining criterion for each of the four stages of civilization was based on the characteristic mode of subsistence economy; upon this level the corresponding levels of knowledge, mode of governance, political and religious institutions, etc. were presumed to causally rely. Each of these stages corresponded to a specific historical age, following upon each other in the mentioned order:<sup>2</sup> 1) the age of the hunter-gathers, 2) the age of pastoralism, or of the shepherds, 3) the age of agriculture, and lastly 4) the age of commerce.<sup>3</sup> These stages could be subdivided further according to some of the other aspects of society. The dynamics ingrained in this stadial approach dissolved any rigid dialectics between civilization and the savage, as if they constituted two mutually exclusive counterparts.<sup>4</sup> Instead a continuative order was favoured; this permitted a gradual and categorical definition where the notions of the *savage* and of *civilization* were transformed into two extremes on the same, sliding scale.

The tripartite distinction between 1) savagery, 2) barbarism, and 3) civilization provided either an alternative or a complementary approach to the one offered by the four stage model. Its defining criteria seem to have been more fluid and context-dependent than the ones which underpinned the four stage model. The tripartite model was invoked within a multitude of widely different discourses, and this seemed to deprive its categories from the more fixed definitions normally associated with more technical discourses; it implied ambiguousness in meaning, both with regard to the normative connotations and in the finer demarcations of the content. When employed within conjectural history, it was attired in the robes of stadial dynamism: it delineated a universal

---

<sup>1</sup> Palmeri, p.6.

<sup>2</sup> Democritus was allegedly the first to split the human societies up in four different stages: the ‘savages’, the ‘nomads’, the ‘agriculturalists’, and finally the ‘polis-structure’ of the Greek city-state, and thus he, as usually, privileged his own form of society as the most advanced. See e.g. Høiris, 2000, p.10, and Høiris, 2001a, pp.132-142.

<sup>3</sup> Høiris, 2000, p.40 and Wokler, p.38.

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of the dynamics between these two related, but opposite, rhetorical strategies, Ellingson, pp.11-13.

evolution from the lowest, savage state, through barbarianism to civilization. L. de Jaucourt expressed a rather common interpretation of the terms when he, in an article in Diderot's great "Encyclopédie", characterized the essential difference between 'savages' and 'barbarians' in the following manner: "There is this difference between *savage* and barbarian peoples, that the first form small scattered nations which prefer never to unite with each other, in place of which the barbarians often unify, & this occurs when one chief submits to another".<sup>1</sup> Thus, the principal distinction between savagery and barbarism appears to have been detected in the level of political organization, rather than on economical grounds.<sup>2</sup> Often it was the roving, nomadic tribes of the Euro-Asian steppe, such as the Huns and the Mongols, who epitomized what might be called the archetypical *barbarian*; but the Germanic tribes, living north of the Roman border in antiquity, were often included in this group too, whereas the scattered North American tribes, such as these were described by Robertson in his acclaimed "History of America" constituted the quintessential savage.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, Crawford's discourses on civilization seem to have been framed along the lines of the four stage model, but the tripartite division also appeared in his texts throughout the whole period from the 1810s to the late 1860s. A quite typical example of this complementary eclecticism, but with the four stage model as the privileged partner, can be encountered in an article from 1863 which begins by declaring that: "man will be found *savage, barbarous, or civilized*, in proportion to the quality of the race to which he belongs, and to the physical character of the country, in which his lot has been cast";<sup>4</sup> and then a few lines later Crawford analysed the relation between the physical environment and the mode subsistence of different societies through a classificatory structure that unequivocally belonged to the conceptual framework of the four stage model.<sup>5</sup>

## 2.2.2 From a Timeless Space towards Spatialized Time.

Just like within the spatial discipline of cartography, the mapping of the past presupposes a systematic projection which secures a consistent approach to- and a coherent interpretation of the otherwise amorphous historical phenomena. Only by being integrated into some kind of prefiguring scheme will the genre of history rise above the level of mere chronicling of meaningless historical events, dispersed in the void of an unstructured past.<sup>6</sup> As emphasised by A. Brower Stahl, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *Ellingson*, 162.

<sup>2</sup> Although this distinction between 'savage' and 'barbarian' dividing line seems to be rather congruent with the one dividing the hunter-gatherers from the pastoralists (and those who practiced a more rude husbandry).

<sup>3</sup> The by far most influential work on this was of course Robertson's "The History of America" (1777). For more on this, see e.g. *Carroll 2004*, *Pocock 2005*, esp. ch.9-11, and *Hargraves*.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1863a*, p.4.

<sup>5</sup> Ellingson claimed that Crawford around 1860 included all non-white societies that had progressed beyond the level of the non-agricultural savages in the barbarian category (*Ellingson*, p.296).

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. *White 1973*, pp.5-7.

conjectural history of the enlightenment marked a decisive step away from the static hierarchy in the formerly held approach of the Great Chain of Being, and it introduced a much more dynamical dimension in its hierarchal ordering of both past and present societies.<sup>1</sup> Even A.O. Lovejoy himself spoke of how “one of the principal happenings in eighteenth-century thought was the temporalizing of the Chain of Being”.<sup>2</sup>

Within the European historiography on Southeast Asia, such a epistemological discrepancy between the older approach rooted in the ideas of a Great Chain of Being on the one hand, and the dynamism inherent in the interpretations offered by conjectural history on the other, becomes overt when one compares W. Marsden’s classification of the Sumatran societies in terms of their place in his global hierarchy of historical as well as present state formations with, for instance, Crawford’s approach. Even in the 3. edition of Marsden’s “History of Sumatra” (HS) from 1811, he maintained the following mode of a globally encompassing civilizational classification with its 5 categories:

”In the first class, I should of course include some of the republics of ancient Greece, in the days of their splendour; the Romans, for some time before and after the Augustan age; France, England, and other refined nations of Europe, in the latter centuries; and perhaps China. The second might comprehend the great Asiatic empires at the period of their prosperity; Persia, the Mogul, the Turkish, with some European kingdoms. In the third class, along with the Sumatrans, and a few other states of the eastern archipelago, I should rank the nations of the northern coast of Africa, and the more polished Arabs. The fourth class, with the less civilized Sumatrans, will take in the people of the new discovered islands in the South Sea; perhaps the celebrated Mexican and Peruvian Empires; the Tartar hordes, and all those societies of people in various parts of the globe, who, possessing personal property, and acknowledging some species of established subordination, rise one step above the Caribs, the New Hollanders, the Laplanders, and the Hottentots, who exhibit a picture of mankind in its rudest and most humiliating aspect.”<sup>3</sup>

Although one cannot altogether a priori discard the possibility of some kind of inherent dynamism in this enumerating categorization, the general impression is, nevertheless, one of a rather static concept of civilization. Emblematic of this is its a-historical conjunction between societies belonging to almost all historical eras: spanning from the ancient Greeks and Romans, over

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stahl*, p.238.

<sup>2</sup> *Lovejoy*, p.244. Curiously enough Lovejoy did not include any of the mentioned Scottish philosophers and historians (not even Hume) in his analysis; the only exception was Ld. Monboddo who was often referred to.

<sup>3</sup> *Marsden 1811*, p.204. A more thorough description is continued on pp.204-216. The 2. ed. From 1784 had an almost identical enumeration on p.167; the only difference is that after having mentioned the Sumatrans as belonging to the third class Marsden also mentioned the “Xoloans”; by this term he most probably referred to the inhabitants of the Sulu (or “Sooloo”) Archipelago, the Sultanate of which had recently, in the period up to 1783, been visited by Dalrymple and later by Capt. T. Forrest: both had published acclaimed accounts of their travels. On Dalrymple, see *Fry*, Ch.2-6.

the Arabs, Mexicans, and Tartars up to the contemporary European societies – as if these were simultaneously existent, as if plotted spots on a timeless map, forever frozen in their (attributed) fixed level of civilization – rather than as dynamical entities evincing different stages, or indeed temporalities,<sup>1</sup> undergoing the same process of progress. To a certain extent this static effect can be attributed to way in which the classes of civilization appear to have been defined by an *extensional* process; that is, by simply enumerating the societies belonging to each class, or level.<sup>2</sup> Although this list of societies was probably intended as exemplifying rather than as providing an exhaustive enumeration, and thus it hinted at some latent definition criteria, it still seemed to imply that any given society would forever be at a standstill, locked in a civilizational stalemate. This would be an inevitable consequence of a classification of civilization that relied on inscribing all societies throughout history into a spatialized and de-temporalized configuration.

In contrast to this, a more dynamically orientated interpretation of civilization not only permitted an intra-societal attention to the changes over time within each society, but it also reconfigured the inter-societal comparisons: it allowed for differences in the level of civilization between contemporary existing states to be assessed as representing temporal differences, where the less civilized society was perceived in its fundamental traits as representing a younger stage of the more mature society. Defined in purely *intensional* criteria – which demarcated the different stages of civilization without any references at all to the actual societies they may contain – such an approach facilitated a filling out of the subject areas of (pre)history through observations of contemporary, putatively more primitive societies;<sup>3</sup> the temporal structure of history was thus configured through the observation of contemporary *primitives* who were deemed to incarnate a “living past”.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, as stressed by B. McGrane, the “very possibility of the conception of “primitive” presupposed the prior commitment to a conception of progress. It was not the factual “discovery” of “primitive peoples” – “primitive peoples” are not the sort of thing that can be “discovered”: “primitives” are made, not found”.<sup>5</sup> And in this respect, the approaches and methodologies ingrained in Scottish conjectural history had paved the way for what T.R. Trautmann has called “the

---

<sup>1</sup> This refers to J. Fabian’s analysis of anthropology’s (and history’s) uses of different forms of temporality: apart from the “straight-forward” *Physical Time*, Fabian also detected a *Mundane Time*, which “indulges in grand-scale periodizing” and is prone to “devise ages and stages”, whereas *Typological Time* primarily makes its distinctions on the basis of binary opposites, such as “traditional vs. modern, peasant vs. industrial”, etc. (*Fabian*, pp.22-23). ‘Conjectural history’ was thus firmly situated especially within the ‘Mundane Time’ frame. (See also *Stahl*, p.237)

<sup>2</sup> The only exception was the distinction between the fourth and the fifth class, where the existence of the concept of personal property and some kind of political organization were represented as constituting the demarcating criteria between the two classes; this roughly resembled the traditional distinction between barbarian and savage societies.

<sup>3</sup> See *Høiris*, 2001b, pp.1-3, 15-17, 38 & 48.

<sup>4</sup> Similarly for India, where B.S. Cohn’s claims that: “The originating assumption on which the British governance was based was that India was best controlled through the preservation of its indigenous practices and institutions. The British assigned themselves the role of being the curators of a vast outdoor museum.” (*Cohn* 1998, p.17)

<sup>5</sup> *McGrane*, p.99. My italics.

revolution in ethnological time”, the impact of which became predominant especially after 1850.<sup>1</sup> The implications of this were that: “It transformed the non-European Other into being the document of predocumented history and the living peoples of the world were arranged, classified, and built up into a stratified schema as though they were the historical peoples of the world. ... In this, like the museum principle, it attempted to overcome time by extending our memory by means of a spatial juxtaposition”.<sup>2</sup> On the basis of these principles a hypothetical, but still considered valid, unilinear model of progression came into existence; this facilitated a credible “reading” of humanity’s past through an *observation* of contemporary primitive societies,<sup>3</sup> and this could contribute with a more detailed knowledge to the more general conjectures provided by the stadial theory when this was applied as an explanative historical model in the shape of conjectural history.<sup>4</sup> The *natural* course of time was thus perceived through the *modus of progression*, and this entailed that any diagnosed instance of societal stagnation or degeneration was seen as a deviation from the norm, and thence in need of an explanation.<sup>5</sup> The “burden of proof” rested solely on explaining the assumed *unnatural* processes of stagnation and degeneration; progression, on the other hand, did not need any explanation since it constituted the *natural* state.

### 2.2.3 Methodologies & Modes of Inferences: The Question of Private Property.

Another important topic within the theories on the universal history of man was composed by the questions of the genesis and (universal) legitimacy of the concept of private property in relation to the development of civilization. In the Scottish Enlightenment the theoretical reflections went beyond the discussions in Hobbes and Locke regarding the legitimacy of property rights in an *a-historical, pre-contractual* state of humanity, in which the lack of societal traits seemed to constitute the very negation of the idea of the civilized man. In contrast to this, the Scottish Enlightenment thinkers inscribed the genesis of the concept of property into the historicising context of the stadial theory of civilization.<sup>6</sup> This context was allegedly not based only on

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann, 1992; for the influence of conjectural history, see pp.389-391. Furthermore, Stocking 1987, pp.69-74.

<sup>2</sup> McGrane, p.94.

<sup>3</sup> In the majority of the descriptions the *most* primitive stage of mankind, man is presented as being totally devoid of individuating features; all men were here equal in their common misery. Here man was (almost) pure nature – without any culture, nor any history through which the characteristics of any given society could be formed and developed.

<sup>4</sup> See Poovey, p.223.

<sup>5</sup> I have here used the term ‘diagnosed’ deliberately since stagnation or degeneration are obviously as much interpreted as they are observed; any such ‘observation’ must, by the very nature of what an observation is, be *underdetermined*, until it is embedded in a theoretical framework where it is ascribed a specific significance as an indicator of either degeneration, stagnation, or progression – or as the absence of any of these. As Trautmann stresses: “Indeed, till the time revolution came about it was an open question whether savages were the living representatives of man’s primitive state, or the degenerate descendants of formerly civilized peoples”. (Trautmann 1992, p.390)

<sup>6</sup> The lowest stage of savagery, however, was deliberately defined in terms of absences by those who conceived the theories. The whole theory can, however, as well be perceived as comprising an epistemological process which actually moved in the reverse direction of what it manifestly did – that the epistemological process was based on *signifying absences* instead of *positive filling out* of the different categories. Rowly-Conwy thus, to my mind, had a valuable point,

philosophical speculations; it was also facilitated by substituting the pre-contractual state of nature with a historicised *initial condition* of mankind. This could be observed through “both historically remote and still existing peoples [who] were deemed to be living in the initial condition”, and with this procedure it was intended to “avoid fanciful speculations and unsound ‘hypotheses’ by founding conjectural history on the rock of the ‘experimental methods’”.<sup>1</sup> This type of argument, as Hopfl argued, actually exhibited a circularity,<sup>2</sup> in as much as this so-called *initial condition* both constituted an essential premise for the validity of the conjectural history, and at the same time it was purportedly being validated by observations of contemporary rude people – whose ‘rudeness’, however, could only be perceived to represent the *initial condition* when seen through the interpretive lenses of the theory of conjectural history. What concerns us here, though, is not as much any logical flaws in the argument as the weight with which it made its impact upon the contemporary mind and society; and here there can be no doubt of its importance, both with regard to the British and especially the Scottish historiography in general and in their descriptions of the history of Southeast Asia in particular.

In regard to the question of the genesis of private property David Hume had argued that “human beings *automatically* recognize that, in order to satisfy the “passion” for property, they have to embrace justice; and embracing justice means that they are already social.”<sup>3</sup> Thence the very idea of society constituted an indispensable trope for the historian,<sup>4</sup> a *conditio sine qua non* in any historical approach, and with the notion of society a concept of private property automatically followed, if not a priori then at least with an empirical certainty.<sup>5</sup> Rousseau placed the genesis of the concept of property as being, both historically and conceptually, intertwined with the introduction of society.<sup>6</sup> Hume perceived both ‘society’ and ‘property’ as constituting two conceptually connected preconditions for having a history, and hence for the possibility of a historical field of study as well. Most of the other Scottish Enlightenment philosophers, however, placed the genesis of the concept

---

when he stated that: “The principal reason for this is that the Four Stage Theory was a means for examining not so much the past, but rather the present.... Thus the first three stages of the Four Stage Theory involved not definition by a series of independent criteria, but rather thinking backwards from present day. Moving back into earlier stages therefore involved the stripping away of more and more contemporary complexities.” (Rowly-Conwy, p.139)

<sup>1</sup> These quotations have been taken from Hopfl, pp.24& 26.

<sup>2</sup> Hopfl, p.26.

<sup>3</sup> Poovey, p.231; the italics are Poovey’s own. Hume analysed this aspect in “On the Origin of Justice and Property”.

<sup>4</sup> Poovey, p.232.

<sup>5</sup> If not logically given, then the connexion between ‘property’ and ‘society’ was at least claimed to be unavoidable in the historical-contingent space, although alternatives might be thought of. This was a moot point at the time, and the ardent interest of most explorers of the unknown places of world and of its ‘rude’ inhabitants seemed to be to observe and examine whether they possessed any notion of ‘private property’.

<sup>6</sup> Barnard, p.35. Rousseau saw the genesis of the concept of ‘private property’ to be caused by technological innovations, not at least the introduction of agriculture which was the result of a demographic growth; with this came the idea of property (to the land tilled and sowed), with time this entailed an unequal distribution of the property, and this later composed the main agent in the formation of the societies which then institutionalised the inequality among its members through the notion of private property – and with this came their unhappiness.

of property *within* the realms of history. Adam Smith thus asserted that ideas of property had been introduced with the transition from the stage of hunter-gatherer to the stage of pastoralism; in this he was supported by W. Robertson,<sup>1</sup> while others tended to place the genesis to have taken place already at the hunter-gatherer stage.<sup>2</sup>

### **2.3 Crawfurd as a Conjectural Historian: Content and Approaches.**

The investigative fields embraced by Crawfurd in both HIA and in the purely descriptive parts of his travelogues on the diplomatic missions to Siam and Cochin China in 1821-1822 and to Ava in 1826-1827 were structured along the lines plotted by the approach which Dugald Stewart had denominated conjectural history. It continued to influence all of Crawfurd's writings up to 1860s, both in terms of the selected content and with regard to the chosen explanative modes. In a recent paper on Crawfurd's HIA, G. Knapman contended that Crawfurd "dismissed Javanese history because of its elite focus", and, "this dismissal indicates that Crawfurd had an extremely functionalist view of history".<sup>3</sup> In Knapman's approach Crawfurd's historiographical interpretations were not assessed within "the context of his intellectual interests",<sup>4</sup> as much as they were perceived as purely instrumental to his shifting ideological agendas. By this approach Knapman claimed to be able to explain some of the more glaring inconsistencies in Crawfurd's discourses. While he was undoubtedly right in stressing the interrelatedness between Crawfurd's ideological ideas, political schemes, and historiographical evaluations, the focus on the instrumentalist aspect of Crawfurd's historiography appears to me to be somewhat one-sided.<sup>5</sup> It ignored the continuities in Crawfurd's thematic selections and in his analytical approaches; besides, those inconsistencies exhibited in HIA and which were pointed out by Knapman – such as a racist attitude combined with an insistence on increased democratic rights for *all* subjects in the British Empire – were already inherent in the general tensions between the universal and the unique in conjectural history's notion of the natural history of man.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the continued influence of conjectural history's traditions and methodologies in Crawfurd's texts proved to be so persistent that by the time of his death in 1868, the "Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië" could with some right write in his obituary that e.g. his

---

1 *Barnard*, p.35-41.

2 *Barnard*, p.35-41.

3 *Knapman 2008a*, p.13.

4 *Knapman 2008a*, p.5.

5 The question of the relationship between knowledge production and power in the context of the British Empire is of course highly contentious; for a recent discussion of varying interpretations of the intertwined epistemological and instrumentalist dimensions of knowledge production, on the extent to which knowledge dictated politics and vice versa, see *Howe*, e.g. pp.164-166.

6 I thus concur with Boon, when he in the case of Marsden, Raffles, and Crawfurd stated that the "rhetoric accompanying political strategies is irreducible to direct instrumental motives; its exaggerations – some of them harmful, others beneficial, most both – continually exceed and outlive them" (*Boon 1990*, p.29)



linguistic writings missed a real scientific character and did not stand the toll of time,<sup>1</sup> something primarily caused by Crawfurd's insistence on inscribing his linguistic research into the framework of conjectural history, as it will be discussed much more in depth in Parts III & IV. Furthermore, Knapman's narrow interpretation here appeared all the more remarkable given that he earlier (although without mentioning Crawfurd explicitly) had emphasised the cogent impact of the theories of conjectural history on the perceptions of the Southeast Asian societies within both British historiography and the political discourses during the first half of the nineteenth-century.<sup>2</sup>

The predicament of conjectural history can be interpreted not just as attributing historiography a pivotal position within the realms of knowledge production and in the ideological exploitation of this, but also as carving out the actual historical content. In 1961 B. Harrison pointed out that "Crawfurd's book is not 'straight' history in our sense. Marsden, Raffles, and Crawfurd all used the title 'History' in something like the original Greek sense of *inquiry*; it meant to them 'a comprehensive view' (a phrase dear to Crawfurd) or a general descriptive account of a country or a region. In their works the strictly historical chapters therefore form only a comparatively small proportion of the whole."<sup>3</sup> He acknowledged that "the interest which his [Crawfurd's] work holds for the modern historian lies less in the historical narrative itself, sketchy and uneven as it is, than in the incidental observations, the asides, with which the historico-sociological treatment of the whole subject is interspersed, revealing as they do his *approach*, his *assumptions*, and his *attitudes* towards the people of the archipelago and their history".<sup>4</sup> Yet, instead of probing deeper into these issues, Harrison ended up by discarding Crawfurd's approaches, assumptions, and attitudes as being composed of, before anything else, personal idiosyncrasies. In contrast to Harrison's rather presentistic interpretation of the term history, its content, and its affiliations, I would like to offer a more *historicist* in reading of Crawfurd's texts and their contexts.<sup>5</sup> That is, in G.W. Stocking's interpretation of the term, where this refers "to the privileging of the questions to which the thinking of Victorian anthropologists provided answers, rather than questions that might be asked about related issues by anthropologists today".<sup>6</sup> This approach will be extrapolated to also, *mutatis mutandis*, include historians, imperial ideologists, politicians, and administrators whenever these in some crucial way or another interacted with Crawfurd and/or his texts.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Trouwens de taalkundige geschriften van Crawfurd missen overal het echt wetenschappelijk karakter, en toonen dat hij als linguist niet op de hoogte van zijn tijd stond" (*Tijdschrift*, p.161)

<sup>2</sup> Knapman 2006, see esp. pp.24-26.

<sup>3</sup> Harrison 1961, p.246.

<sup>4</sup> Harrison 1961, pp.247-248; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> And thus "to see historical change as a complex process of emergence rather than a simple linear sequence – in short to understand science of a given period in its own terms." (Stocking 1982, p.8)

<sup>6</sup> Stocking 1987, p.285.

Even in M.C. Quilty's otherwise well-informed study it was stated that: "given Marsden's, Raffles' and Crawford's self-proclaimed adherence to 'facts' alone, there is a surprising lack of anxiety about this sort of 'conjecture' in their texts".<sup>1</sup> But in a more historicist reading of the fundamental premises embedded in the approach employed by these three, such a "lack of anxiety" should hardly appear that surprising at all; especially Crawford was, as shown by Rendall,<sup>2</sup> deeply inculcated with this approach during his years at Edinburgh University. Instead, this approach ought to accentuate the interest in a crucial theme, already touched upon by Quilty herself<sup>3</sup> – viz. the inter-textual, rhetorical processes through which these (often explicitly stated) qualified conjectures eventually were transmuted from conditioned *conjectures* into undisputed historical *data*, and later perhaps even presented as incontrovertible *facts*, simply by the act of being quoted and/or replicated sufficiently often in other texts. It was then upon such material that manageable ideologies were framed and political strategies were executed.

In the following I aim at analysing the general contours of the interpretive framework in which Crawford's arguments seem to have been embedded, and hence these profoundly informed the debates and controversies in which Crawford partook over the years. These debates will then compose the main content of the remaining Parts that follow in the wake of this. Thus, in the following, I will not embark on a thorough investigation of the elements of conjectural history in Crawford's discourses; instead I merely endeavour to provide an analytic template which will inform and structure the rest of the dissertation.<sup>4</sup>

### 2.3.1 Approaching, Classifying, and Structuring the Indian Archipelago.

The meaning of the term history in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century differed, as Harrison pointed out, substantially from the one with which it is associated today. In his celebrated "Anniversary Discourses", Sir William Jones thus introduced an interesting tripartite distinction between what he denominated *history*, *science or philosophy*, and *art*: to the domain of history belonged "the observation and remembrance of *mere facts*, independent of *ratiocination*, which belongs to philosophy, or of *imitations* and *substitutions*, which are the province of art".<sup>5</sup> The criteria behind this distinction obviously referred to the mode of approach, rather than to the topic

---

<sup>1</sup> Quilty 1998, p.47.

<sup>2</sup> Curiously there are no references to "this overlooked but important article" neither in any of Quilty's, nor of Knapman's texts. The quote is taken from Ballantyne 2001, p.99. Quilty only refers to the purely medical aspects of Crawford's university experience (Quilty 1998, p.29)

<sup>3</sup> Quilty 1998, p.37.

<sup>4</sup> Such a more thorough enterprise would to a certain extent only have constituted a supplement to Quilty's insightful, albeit not systematically exhaustive, analysis. On Crawford, see Quilty 1998, esp. pp.28-30, 41-49, 70-82 & 101-109.

<sup>5</sup> Here quoted from Aarsleff 1967/1983, p.127. These references were dispersed throughout the "Anniversary Discourses", and they comprised a key aspect in Jones' ideas on gaining and producing knowledge. See also Trautmann 1997/2004, p.60 for further interpretations of the implications of this distinction.

itself; it could be applied to all branches of knowledge, and it was stated that “we are only historians when we announce facts, and philosophers, only when we reason on them”.<sup>1</sup> Jones invoked this distinction in his discourse in order to divorce his brand of comparative philology from the airy spheres of both the *philosophical* universal grammar and the highly speculative conjectural etymologies, such as these were practiced by e.g. his contemporary Jacob Bryant. With this rhetorical distinction, Jones aimed at securing comparative philology a place within the realm of an empirically grounded *history*. Recourse to more or less speculative conjectures necessarily, however, had to be systematically taken when applying the *facts* obtained through these linguistic studies within the fields of history and ethnology; it was this latter intellectual operation that comprised Jones’s main field of research, such as it has been pointed out by especially Trautmann.<sup>2</sup>

When facing the choice between *hard*, but hardly pertinent, *facts* on the one hand, and on the other the derived, and hence invariably conditioned, *softer facts* dealing with important issues, then the latter was more often than not considered the lesser evil.<sup>3</sup> If it was conjectural history, or no history at all (or, subsidiary, what was regarded as a history based on an even more compromised set of sources and inferences), then both Sir William Jones and the rest of the Orientalists shared the same fundamental methodological approach as the Conjectural Historians and the Utilitarians alike. Rather, they tended only to differ 1) in choice of sources upon which these facts were procured, 2) in the specific theories into which they were inscribed and adduced as decisive evidence, and at times 3) in the grander referential frameworks which – in their fundamental way of accessing and assessing the world – privileged one kind of theory over another.

The narrative order sustained within the different chapters in HIA and within the descriptive latter half of Crawford’s two travelogues reveals a great deal about Crawford’s classificatory approach to the past and present societies in Southeast Asia. Thus vol.I of HIA was comprised of four “Books”, the first dedicated to a description of the “Character” of the people of the region; this referred both to the “Physical Form of the Inhabitants of the archipelago”, as the title of the first chapter indicates, and to their “Manners and Character”, as well as to the ceremonies involved in their daily life. These latter ones reflected the specific *mores* of these societies; the fact that those were integrated into the same part of the book as the description of the physical aspects of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Aarsleff 1967/1983, p.128.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Trautmann 1997/2004, pp.41-61 and Trautmann 2006, pp.15: “When we examine it in its original context, the breakthrough quality [of Jones’s philology] is not entirely lost but it is considerably qualified. The main thing to grasp about the “Anniversary discourses” is that they were an ethnological and historical study, not a linguistic one as such; thus the language data function in the argument as evidence for propositions about historical relations among nations or races, not for propositions about historical relations about languages as an end in itself.” (Trautmann’s italics)

<sup>3</sup> This distinction between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ ‘facts’ in this context I have borrowed from Trautmann 2005, p.xxxii.

different peoples in the region testifies to the assumed intimate relation within conjectural history between the natural history of Man and the history of society.

Although not exclusively dedicated to the bodily entities of Man, Crawford's broader notions of race was nevertheless quite physically orientated throughout his entire career;<sup>1</sup> this implied that it was primarily the concept of race which structured his descriptions of the natural history of Man in these texts. The HIA delineated a racial divide between the "brown-complexioned people, with lank hair" and the "black, or rather sooty-coloured race"<sup>2</sup> in the Indian Archipelago: but being almost exclusively preoccupied with the former group, the text did not dwell much on this binary division during the rest of the three volumes.<sup>3</sup>

In his description of Siam a proclaimed racial correspondence was invoked to sustain the claim that the Siamese formed a part of "a distinct and peculiar family of *the human race*", "inhabiting the tropical regions, lying between Hindostan and China".<sup>4</sup> Based on physical evidence, Crawford thus claimed the existence, as well as demarcating the extension, of a *Hindoo-Chinese race* which differed from Leyden's *Indo-Chinese Nations*<sup>5</sup> in not including the Malayan branch. Curiously, Crawford did not explicitly buttress this categorization with linguistic arguments, such as he normally used to within his pre-1860s discourses, and in a rather atypical fit of humility he recognized that "the interesting question of language requires more attention and learning than I can bestow on it. My information is derived from others, for I had neither leisure nor opportunity to acquire any thing beyond a very superficial acquaintance with its elements".<sup>6</sup> Crawford later reiterated his opinion of the "affinity subsisting between the *races of men* which inhabit the wide regions between Bengal and China";<sup>7</sup> the remarkable here is how the term *race* is interchangeably employed to denote various different scales of human (and societal) division: on the top we have "the human race", and at the other end of the scale it refers to national, or similar ethnic, entities which, when grouped together, in conjunction comprised an intermediate, third racial level. It was this latter category that Crawford denominated the *Hindoo-Chinese Race*, characterized by "the striking accordance which they [the people belonging to this] offer in all *essential points* amongst

---

<sup>1</sup> In this Crawford did not seem to deviate much from the norm; in a similar context, S. Kapila has recently stressed the point that the "issue of race and the typology of difference were at the heart of the so-called Scottish and north European Enlightenment." (Kapila, p.511) For more on the fundamental issue of race in the northern European Enlightenment, see e.g. Kidd 2006, pp.79-120, and the articles in Eigen & Larrimore. Sankar Muthu's "Enlightenment Against Empire" (2003) discussed many of the same issues, but it generally focussed on the anti-imperialist elements within the thoughts of some of the more renowned Enlightenment philosophers.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.18.

<sup>3</sup> This aspect of Crawford's discourse will be analysed later in this chapter.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.310.

<sup>5</sup> Leyden 1811, p.158-160. Leyden's study was limited to the linguistic traits, literature, and their own historical accounts. On Leyden's study on the 'Thay', see pp.240-254. See also Trautmann 2006, pp.86-96, as well as Parts II & IV of this dissertation.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.333. Yet he did not totally abstain from conjectures upon this topic, as the following indicates.

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.340.

themselves, and their no less obvious dissimilitude to all other Asiatic races”. These most essential part consisted of “the same *physical configuration*; their *languages* radically agree in structure and idiom; and their *manners, habits, and usages* are alike”.<sup>1</sup> The Cochin Chinese and Tonquinese were classified as belonging to the *Annam race*, but only when they were inscribed into a more civilization-orientated discourse.<sup>2</sup> Although the “many distinct nations, or tribes” inhabiting the Burman territory differed in “language, and often in manners, custom, and religion”, they, nonetheless, all belonged to “the same physical type”,<sup>3</sup> viz. that of the Hindoo-Chinese. However, apart from this brief description of racial similarities and discrepancies, Crawford seemed more interested in determining the level of civilization through subsequent binary comparisons with the neighbouring nations of Hindostan, China, Siam, and the Indian Archipelago.

The next Book in Vol.I of HIA dealt with the “Arts”. Arts in this context referred to “Useful Arts”, such as the architecture of buildings and the construction towns and villages, the art of weaving and manufacture of clothes, the working of metal, and the manufacture and use of different types of tools. Crawford here stated that: “In rendering this account, I shall follow the *natural progress of the arts in the march of civilization*, beginning with those that are most *simple* and *necessary*”.<sup>4</sup> Thus “the progress which the Siamese have made in the useful arts are extremely slender”;<sup>5</sup> in contrast to this somewhat dismissive evaluation it was stated that “the progress which the Cochin Chinese and the Tonquinese, but especially the latter, have made in useful arts, although very moderate, is certainly superior to that of attained by the Siamese – the islanders of the Indian Archipelago, or indeed any people of Eastern Asia – the Hindoos, Chinese, and Japanese excepted”.<sup>6</sup> The various forms of dress worn by the people were included in this part too; an easily observable aspect of society, it was ascribed a synecdochical quality and as such it would facilitate quick assessments of allegedly deeper, hidden outlines of the society; – in the case of Burma it was thus asserted that “too much of the body is left naked, which gives an impression of barbarism”;<sup>7</sup> whereas in the Siamese case “both sexes wear fewer clothes than any other tolerably civilized people of the East”.<sup>8</sup> Although it was only in HIA that the “Art of War” was included in this part, the descriptive modes of this topic did not differ much in the texts; the same goes for the book on “Agriculture” which was also treated elsewhere in the travelogues, but again in a similar manner.

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.341. Remark how his earlier admitted lack of profound insight into the region’s linguistic traits did not deter him from presenting this one of the criteria that indicated a racial similitude! In addition to these “essential points”, he also added the here admittedly “arbitrary or accidental” aspect of a shared religion. Crawford would, as seen, by 1834 perceive this region as not only being inhabited by the same race, but also by one unified civilization.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.481.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.372.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.156. My italics.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.322.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.482.

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.375.

<sup>8</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.312.

Upon the foundation laid by “Useful arts” a superstructure consisting of the recorded “Progress in Science and the Higher Arts” followed. To this class belonged the disciplines of arithmetic and, when necessary, other types of mathematics; then came astronomy,<sup>1</sup> astrology, as well as the ideas on how to record time and the technologies employed in their calendars; it also included navigation & geography, both in theory and practice; and finally followed medicine and music.

Agriculture provided the main means of subsistence for all the advanced societies described in HIA and the travelogues. Given that the mode of subsistence within conjectural history was considered the quintessential, or even the outright prescribing, element in the determination of the reached stage of civilization, this topic, accordingly, received a thorough analytical attention.

The second volume of HIA was comprised of three books on the “Language”, “Religion”, and “History” of the Indian Archipelago, and in particular of Java. Not much will be said of these here since they will be analyzed much more in depth in the forthcoming parts. The category of language, which also included the study of literature and systems of writing, was crucial to Crawford’s methodological approach to these extra-European societies and their history: it served as the analytical picklock which, when managed skilfully, could procure an access to the otherwise secluded field of the formative, but pre-documented history of the region, as well as providing insights into the racial, national, and civilizational aspects of these societies in both present and past periods of time.

The the parts on religion were not solely intended to map the present distribution of the various world religions within the Indian Archipelago and the Hindoo-Chinese nations, nor merely to report on the influence exerted by the religious institutions upon these societies;<sup>2</sup> just as important was its function as a heuristic medium which provided access to the genius and civilizational stage of the ancient civilizations in the region. Sir William Jones had included religion as one of the four kinds of evidence, through which the Oriental could be approached.<sup>3</sup> Although this topic seemed more affiliated with Romanticist notions of a glorious, yet by now vanished, past than with the notions of a *natural* progression inherent in conjectural history, it did not impede Crawford from incorporating this kind of evidence when he examined this subject within his own theoretical framework; this, however, did not imply that he ended up agreeing in minute detail with Raffles in “emphasising at length the vanished glories of Java”,<sup>4</sup> let alone drawing the same political conclusions as Raffles.

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect especially A. Smith’s essay on “The History of Astronomy” seems to have been a valuable source of inspiration.

<sup>2</sup> Although this was considered being pervasive in both Siam and especially in Ava (Burma); in the latter country Buddhism was perceived as a state religion, contributing substantially to the Oriental despotism prevalent there.

<sup>3</sup> These consisted of: 1) language and letters, 2) religion and philosophy, 3) architecture and sculpture, and 4) arts and manufactures. (Trautmann 1997/2004, p.41)

<sup>4</sup> Quilty 1998, p.68; see also ch.4 in *Aljunied 2005*. Crawford thus stated in rather unequivocal terms that: “The theory of a great monarchy, and of antecedent state of high civilization and improvement, so often pretended by the Brahmins,

Raffles' examinations of the ancient ruins on central Java, and especially the lavishly produced illustrations of these accompanying his "History of Java" (1817) produced by the two Daniells, have recently received a well deserved attention within the historiography of Southeast Asia.<sup>1</sup> Like Raffles, Crawfurd was also a keen collector of indigenous manuscripts,<sup>2</sup> and he had himself conducted examinations of what was later to become the two most famous temple complexes on the island, Prambanan and Borobudur. These materialized into two articles published in the "Asiatick Researches" in 1816 and in "Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay" (1820), upon which he based this part of HIA. Apart from the antiquarian examination of these monuments, another source of evidence was encountered in the still existing Hindu society on Bali; Crawfurd visited this island in his capacity as a diplomat.<sup>3</sup> Through the by now familiar temporalizing of space, Bali was inscribed into the discourse as a living representative of Java's past, or as a sort of a living museum.<sup>4</sup> References to indigenous manuscripts, one of the traditional sources of evidence within the Orientalist studies on Asian religions,<sup>5</sup> were, however, scarce in this part of HIA. Only in his description of the ancient religion in Burma did he rely mainly on Burmese manuscripts, and in this case he seemed to have acted more as a collector and informant than as an expert in his own right: here he thus referred to the renowned Orientalist H.H. Wilson<sup>6</sup> when drawing his civilizational inferences on basis of information gleaned from these manuscripts.<sup>7</sup>

The part on "History" consisted of the civil history of the areas in question, such as this could be extracted from indigenous written source-material – in HIA complemented with European ditto. This encapsulated both "mythological history" and the political history of more recent times,<sup>8</sup> and it was structured as a strictly *chronological narrative*. Given, however, Crawfurd's low estimation of the trustworthiness of the content of the indigenous written sources and his inveterate criticism of

---

has also been forged by national vanity of the Javanese, unsupported, as already remarked, by a shadow of proof, and contradicted by unquestionable internal evidence." (HIA, vol.II, p.297)

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Bastin & Rohatgi, *Forge*, Díaz-Andreu (pp.217-218), and most recently Tiffin 2008 and Tiffin 2009.

<sup>2</sup> Carey 1978 and Carey 1979.

<sup>3</sup> Crawfurd 1816b, pp.128-129.

<sup>4</sup> For an analysis of this, see Boon 1990, pp.37-45. In Roberts 1999, it is described how some of the remote mountain regions on Java itself was ascribed roughly the same function. See also Part II in this dissertation.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Marshall & Williams, pp.90-93, where the antiquarian mode is contrasted to that which informed the natural history of Man.

<sup>6</sup> On Wilson's career as Secretary to the Asiatic Society, see *Kejariwal*, ch.4; later Wilson took up the Boden Chair at Oxford (*Aarsleff* 1967/1983, p.137), and lived have a long, illustrious career as an Orientalist scholar in Great Britain.

<sup>7</sup> Crawfurd 1829a, p.69. In Crawfurd 1828a, Crawfurd referred to him as "Mr. Horace Wilson, the enlightened and accomplished secretary of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta", (p.360) he also referred to "the ingenious suggestions of Mr. Wilson", (p.366) and to "the judicious conjectures of Mr. Wilson" (p.367). Later, back in England, Crawfurd and Wilson enjoyed a continued correspondence between each other, and in *Crawfurd 1856* he was consistent referred to as "my friend Professor Wilson".

<sup>8</sup> In including the former part, Crawfurd deviated markedly from the approach he had taken some years earlier when he authored "A Short Sketch of the Native History of Java"; there he wrote: "Javanese history makes no pretence to great antiquity, and there seems good reason to believe that the period when these Islanders first emerged from Barbarism cannot be extremely remote. What in relation to them might be deemed *true history*, does not embrace a period of more than five centuries." (my italics). BL, Add.30353, p.25.

earlier European colonialism in the region, it is not surprising that he apparently did not ascribe this part of the book an authoritative status as presenting the most authentic picture of the region and its past.<sup>1</sup> More interesting than the content of this part was actually what was left out of it: the more recent political history, including the British invasion and occupation of Java, 1811-1816. This discursive dissociation of the present from the past – including the recent, and according to Crawford tainted, history of monopolistic colonialism – seemed to exonerate the present British enterprise in the region from any implication in the former “colonial intrigue and depravity”,<sup>2</sup> characterizing the preceding period of European interference. This implied that the British could appear, not as yet another breed of conquerors bent of exploiting the region, but rather as liberators – with the potential to save the inhabitants from both their own despotic modes of government and from the tyrannical and monopolistic yoke of the earlier European colonizers.<sup>3</sup>

The last volume contained Book VIII on “Political Institutions” and Book IX on “Commerce”. Within the scope of “Political Institutions” came: 1) the mode and structure of government as well as its administrative implementation, 2) the social structure of the society and the different classes of which it was composed,<sup>4</sup> 3) The jurisprudence and the degree of its practical implementation in society, and 4) The sources of income for the state in the shape of the system of revenue, both in theory and practice. A description of the military was added to this part in the travelogues – probably an indication of how the military was seen as being more integrated into the notion and function of the *state* within the relatively fixed state formations of Siam, Cochin China, and Ava, than it was in the (allegedly) more primitive state formations rife in the Indian Archipelago. As it will be argued in Part II, all of these aspects of society seem to have been inscribed into the trope of *Oriental despotism* – a trope which prefigured Crawford’s conceptual approach to the region and its inhabitants, and thus it exerted an overwhelming influence upon his discourse. Commerce, both in terms of the internal market and of external trade, was not only perceived as a certain sign of an advanced stage of civilization, but it was furthermore seen as the most affluent source for future improvement. To such an ardent advocate of free trade as Crawford, this field seemed so attractive that he devoted almost 400 pages to this topic in HIA. A fact which prompted a contemporary reviewer to insinuate that this part of the book was the real motive for publishing it, and the rest

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford thus, for instance, attributed more credibility to the subject area of the ancient history of Java in the section on “Religion”, than the one presented here: “The remote history of the Javanese is, in fact, a fit topic for a *dissertation on antiquities*, rather than a *subject for history*, and will soon be discovered to relate with propriety to the portion of this work which treats of the ancient religion and antiquities of the island.” (HIA, vol.II, p.295)

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.285.

<sup>3</sup> A similar reading of John Hunt’s report to Raffles on Borneo and the endemic state of piracy there can be found in *Teng*, pp.562-564. Hunt’s report was reprinted in *Moor 1837*, Appendix pp.12-30. See also Part IV.

<sup>4</sup> This analytical category was devoted a particular attention in the description of more advanced Asian societies which were perceived as extremely structured in this respect. In the case of India, this was illustrated by the keen interest in the caste system and its intrusiveness upon all aspects of society.



only served as a pseudo-scientific, legitimating varnish behind which Crawford's economic ideologies were hidden.<sup>1</sup> When a heavily abridged German edition of HIA was published only a year after, in 1821, this actually consisted only of a (non-abridged) translation of the part of Volume III that dealt with "Commerce", i.e. Book IX.<sup>2</sup>

Apart from the epistemological value attributed to these two latter categories (political institutions and commerce) within the framework of conjectural history, they obviously also demanded some interest for more mundane reasons. Questions on governance and legislation necessarily had to be addressed when occupying and colonising a foreign, already inhabited soil, and not at least when the obligations associated with this had to be funded and a source of income had to be secured through a workable revenue system. Commerce, obviously, played a pivotal part in all of this too. It was exactly such convergences between theoretical interest and practical need that made conjectural history so applicable in the colonial setting.

Besides these, more "classical", analytical categories Crawford also introduced an *enumerative modality*, to use Cohn's concept, through his inclusion of numerous statistical tables and calculations. Those were especially incorporated into the investigative fields of economy and demography. That is, a movement from 'statistics' in its older sense, as 'statecraft', towards the more modern meaning of the term – as a quantifying methodology.<sup>3</sup> However, in his earlier texts (like the HIA), this modality was still only applied rather tentatively since the statistical data, upon which the processing within this modality relied, more often than not dealt with regions beyond British, and indeed often European, control.

### **2.3.2 Defining the Stage of Civilization and Identifying the Causes of Progress.**

In the theoretical framework of conjectural history each of these topics were also ascribed a function as signifying parameters within the interpretive grid of civilization; they served to classify the stage reached by each society within the civilizational hierarchy. In theory, the aspects of society described through these topics were interrelated and to a large degree perceived as being determined by the mode of subsistence economy; however, a possibility of deviance from this general rule was recognized, and, more important, the rather crude classification of the four stage theory needed to be supplemented with more detailed subdivisions, facilitating a classificatory hierarchy *within* the each of the four stages as well. This implied that, in order to determine the reached level of civilization of any society, it would be preferable to assess several of its (assumed)

---

<sup>1</sup> An anonymous reviewer in the Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register (Vol.X, Jul-Dec 1820), p.145.

<sup>2</sup> See Crawford 1821.

<sup>3</sup> Pels 1999, p.89, and Stagl 1995.

most important aspects, stretching from subsistence economy and modes of production to the organization of society and the structure of their ideas.

A fundamental problem in all such multi-faceted approaches is the question of the relative importance attributed to each of the parameters within the general assessment: this relationship was never unequivocally established within conjectural history, not even in Crawford's own discourses. In other words, the importance ascribed to each of these societal parameters was decided within each specific context; this, on the one hand, seemed to allow a more genuine appreciation of each society on its own terms, but on the other it implied a loss of the methodological rigidity which this approach pretended to possess. Thus personal biases (and not just the cultural ones, analytically inherent any kind of classification) and preconceived notions could be substantiated through this approach, and thus being attired in an authoritative discourse and vested with a scientific credibility.

T.R. Trautmann has argued that James Mill's use of civilization as an analytical, stratifying concept in his "History of British India" ought to be interpreted in this way: "The effect of the complex and composite character of the components of "civilization" is that its content eludes definition, which gives the analyst – Mill himself – degrees of freedom to shift ground at need".<sup>1</sup> And accordingly, in the opinion of most modern and many contemporary readers, Mill notoriously (ab)used this freedom to always approach Indian society from the angles that accentuated its least favourable aspects, and grossly understated or ignored its assets.<sup>2</sup>

Crawford only seldom spelled out explicitly the criteria that defined his concept of civilization; the reader was probably assumed to be familiar with these ones beforehand, as constituting a cultural commonplace shared between reader and writer. However, in 1861, as we have seen, Crawford stated some minimum criteria, which had to be met in order for a society to be called civilized, and which comprised the cultivation of useful plants, the domestication of useful animals, the knowledge of useful metals, the production of textiles, and the possession of a written language.<sup>3</sup> But he did not state anything about how to proceed the analysis when it came to more advanced societies which were beyond this stage and already deemed civilized. In the article "The Countries, Nations, and Languages of the Oceanic Region" from 1834, he briefly enumerated the parameters used in his assessment of the achieved level of civilization amongst the societies in the region; just like in 1861 he began with the "basics", i.e. the modes of *agriculture*, the possession of

---

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann 1997/2004, p.123; for the entire analysis, see pp.117-124

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Pels 1999 for an analysis of H.H. Wilson's highly critical annotation to Mill's text in the 1844 edition of the "History of India". But even more important was its cogent history of reception as one of most important work of reference that was read by all aspiring Indian hands during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C before they went out to India.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1861a, p.159.

*domesticated animals*, the cultivation and the processing of the cotton plant<sup>1</sup> into *textiles*, and then he proceeded with the extension of both useful and precious *metals*, and the use of the latter as “*money in their commerce*”; then “the art of *writing*” was included, together with the possession of an *calendar*, and lastly the *religion* and *political institutions* were considered, especially with regard to their capacity for “preserving order, and securing life and property”.<sup>2</sup> However, neither did this prescribe anything explicit regarding the ascription of the relative importance of each of these different aspects, even though it could be argued to be inherent in the rationale that the more advanced the society was deemed to be, the more important were the social and the more abstract aspects – such as political institutions, money economy, writing, time keeping, and religion.

Not only was the distribution of the relative importance of the various classificatory parameters associated with an element of interpretive freedom, but the same tended to be the case within each of these – and especially when the “produced result” deviated too much from the expected, or the desired, one. The perhaps most glaring example of this can be encountered in Crawford’s treatment of the field of arithmetic as a classificatory parameter. Crawford’s use of this, one of “the most abstract ideas which the human mind is capable of forming”,<sup>3</sup> was rather consistent throughout his entire career; through an examination of both 1) the existence of the different numerical concepts<sup>4</sup> and of 2a) the size and 2b) the names of the highest numbers in each society, Crawford reconstructed both the ‘original’ civilizational level of the different nations, or races, and the routes (and relative chronologies) of the dissemination of these numerical concepts (1 & 2a) through the genealogy of names of the numerals (2b). These were taken to mirror the general patterns of the dissemination of civilization.

The most thorough implementation of the arithmetical field in his studies on civilization was in an article from 1863, simply entitled: “On the Numerals as evidence of the Progress of Civilization”.<sup>5</sup> At the onset it was stated that “the social condition of a people is, therefore, in a

---

<sup>1</sup> In HIA Crawford launched an elaborate hypothesis, based on reasoned and linguistic conjectures, in which he argued that the loom was autochthonous to the Indian Archipelago, whereas the cultivation and use of cotton was introduced from India, and not known before the advent of the ancient Sanskrit civilizations in the region (HIA, Vol.I, pp.176-182)

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1834a*, p.380.

<sup>3</sup> Stated by Adam Smith in his essay “Considerations Concerning the First Formation of Languages”; quoted in *Struik*, p.10.

<sup>4</sup> Such as e.g. different number systems.

<sup>5</sup> Michael Barany has recently received a special commendation at the Singer Prize (awarded by the British Society for the History of Science) for a paper on “Savage Numbers: Counting, Race, and the Evolution of Civilization in Victorian Prehistory”, a shorter version of another paper, “Prehistories of Counting”; the abovementioned article by Crawford is accorded a prominent place in both papers, the only ones which, to my knowledge, discuss it at any length. Barany has in these papers aptly situated Crawford and his theories within their contemporary scientific and cultural contexts, and then discussed them in relation to the theories articulated by e.g. F. Galton, A.R. Wallace, and J. Lubbock. (*Barany 2009*, pp.15-20, and *Barany 2010*, pp.12-19) My concern here, however, is rather to assess the article in relation to the aspects of change and continuity over time *within* Crawford’s own discourse, and my contention is that, within this field of arithmetic, it was characterised by a strong strand of continuity. I will discuss Crawford’s theories from the 1860s within their contemporary contexts in Part IV.

good measure indicated by its numeral system; and, taking this as a test of civilization, I proceed to apply it to the different races of the human family”.<sup>1</sup> This was followed by an examination of the existence and names of the numerals all around the world, from the inhabitants on Kamschatka and the ancient Assyrians to the Hottentots. But later in the article certain qualifying addenda were inserted, and it was specified that: “The state of the numerals is a test of the progress which a people has made in civilization, but the *quality of the race of man*, and the *presence or absence, the abundance or scarcity, of indispensable accessories to progress*, must be taken into consideration in applying it”.<sup>2</sup> He did not state any reason for these qualifying considerations. But soon what seemed to be the real reason was revealed, when Crawford insisted that:

“It is important to notice that the mere invention of very high numbers can be admissible as evidence of comparative civilization, only within the same race of man. The precocious Hindus and Chinese were in possession of them, or, perhaps, more correctly, their sacerdotal orders were so, for thousands of years before they were invented by *the Europeans, who had recourse to them only when a practical necessity arose for them*, and this did not happen until so late a time as the beginning of the fourteenth century”.<sup>3</sup>

Instead of positing the “precocious Hindus and Chinese” above the Europeans on the scale of civilization, the premises were changed ad hoc by adding the qualifying exclusion of inter-racial comparisons. Furthermore, Crawford suddenly introduced a criterion of *utility* as well, stating that it was not merely the size of the numerals that mattered, but also the function they served, and here the idle – or even socially detrimental – uses of these numerals among the advanced Asiatic nations differed markedly from the practical manner in which the Europeans incorporated them into a system of precise accounts of their ever increasing trade. Rather than abetting the progress of civilization, the Asiatic use of their knowledge of high numerals actually served to arrest it: it indicated a stagnant society where a tiny group of priests strove to monopolise all knowledge. In all its major epistemic and moral aspects this interpretation resembled James Mill’s 45 years older analysis of Indian astronomy.<sup>4</sup>

Apart from the world-wide classification of all societies into a civilizational hierarchy, Crawford also wanted to provide a set of universally valid explanations of the dynamic aspects present in the theories of conjectural history and socio-evolutionary inclined anthropology. In this way the development of society could be accounted for, and it could be explained why some societies had

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1863b, p.84

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1863b, pp.100-101. (My italics)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1863b, p.101. (My italics)

<sup>4</sup> Trautmann 1997/2004, pp123-124.

advanced more than others. In his approach Crawford maintained a staunch environmentalist position throughout his entire career. In time this got increasingly diversified in terms of the steadily growing number of significant parameters; the racial element was ever present, but throughout the years it moved from being rather secondary into the forefront of the discourse – an undeniable fact testified alone by the titles of many of his articles published in the 1860s.

One of the more renowned aspects of HIA was the insistence on “the influence of food in forming the character of the different races”. This implied that “no country has produced a great or civilized race, but a country which by its fertility is capable of yielding a supply of *farinaceous* grain of the first quality. Man seems never to have made progress in improvement, when feeding on inferior grains, farinaceous roots, on fruits, or on the pith of trees”.<sup>1</sup> Hence the (possibility for the) cultivation of a farinaceous grain constituted a *conditio sine qua non* for obtaining a relative high level of civilization, but nothing here suggested that the presence of this alone was sufficient to explain the growth of civilization. In the Indian Archipelago this “farinaceous grain” obviously appeared in the shape of rice,<sup>2</sup> and Crawford encountered its the local “antithesis” in the production and consumption of sago which characterised in particular the Eastern part of the Archipelago. He thus emphasised that “the savages of New Guinea, surrounded at this day by the most splendid, beautiful, and rare objects of animal and vegetable nature, live naked and uncultivated. Civilization originated in the west, where are situated the countries capable of producing corn”.<sup>3</sup> The perhaps most interesting fact here was that Crawford chose to explain the difference in level of civilization solely by recourse to the mode of subsistence, without any references to the fact that this line between the rice- and the sago producing zones roughly corresponded with the racial divide between the brown-complexioned and the black, or sooty-coloured races. Thence, Crawford seemed in 1820 to consider the mode of subsistence a more fundamental or important factor than race in explaining the achieved level of civilization.<sup>4</sup> He later reiterated this mode of explanation, for instance in 1828, 1834, and 1856.<sup>5</sup>

Although this environmentalism seem to have been shared by Marsden too,<sup>6</sup> one of the contemporary reviewers of HIA actually rebuked Crawford’s statement of this “fact, as he calls it,

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA Vol.I, pp.14-15. Also quoted in *Quilty 1998*, p.29, and *Knapman 2008b*, pp.5-6.

<sup>2</sup> On the problems with rice as a “provider” of civilization, see Part II in this dissertation; here I analyse Crawford’s argument on how the cultivation of rice carried with it an immanent inclination toward (Oriental) despotism.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.15.

<sup>4</sup> Despite both quoting this part of HIA and being deeply committed to an analysis of *race*, this interesting point is not noticed in neither *Quilty 1998* nor in *Knapmann 2008b*.

<sup>5</sup> See *Crawford 1828a*, p.54; *Crawford 1834a*, p.380 (“Wherever the culture of grain is understood, and it is so among all the principal nations, civilization has most advanced. Where the people live on the produce of the sago-palm, and bread-fruit, they have made less progress, and are found universally ignorant of the use of letters. Where fish is the chief subsistence, they are in a still lower state; and they are always savage when they live upon the casual produce of the forests, honey, wild roots, and game”); see also e.g. *Crawford 1856*, p.372 a similar assessment.

<sup>6</sup> See *Marsden 1811*, pp.54-55.

but we term theory,...There can be no necessary connexion between the civilization of man and the grain upon which he feeds. The truth is, that by a confusion in reasoning, the effect is substituted for the cause”.<sup>1</sup> The reviewer admitted that the cultivation of farinaceous grain might prove conducive to civilization, but it would not bring it about; on the contrary, it presupposed it. He did not provide any explanation on how civilization then could have originated, but given the idea of the infallibility of the Biblical genealogy that he maintained in this review,<sup>2</sup> and the general insistence within the *The British Review* on vindicating a Christian and Biblical interpretation of the world, the resistance towards Crawford’s blunt materialism could hardly seem surprising.

Crawford also explained the predominant modes of state formation in the Indian Archipelago by referring to its environmental characteristics. Thus he concluded that: “in tracing the progress of social order among the tribes of the Indian Islands I make no reference to the *shepherd state*. Such a form of society could, in fact, never have existed in these countries, from the very nature of things.”<sup>3</sup> The result of never having experienced this second stage of civilization was that Java “has *never* been permanently united under sovereign”, despite of being “compact, defined, and, compared to great empires, limited”.<sup>4</sup> This implied that their political institutions had never matured, but, as Crawford pointed out, “we shall perhaps, however, underrate the improvement of the Javanese, by applying to them too rigidly this *test of civilization*”.<sup>5</sup> This deviation from the normal, or *natural*, progress of society was ascribed a combination of the presence of a luxurious climate and natural impediments causing the abovementioned absence of the shepherd state.

”They possess the necessities, the comforts, and some of the refinements, - perhaps of the luxuries of life, - in a far superior degree to most of the Nomade tribes, who effected and retained the mighty conquests of Europe, Western Asia, and China. The shepherd state, the offspring of the cold and immeasurable plains of Tartary, and the school of both war and government, could have no existence among the woods, the narrow valleys, and soft climate of Java. The Javanese are *naturally* an unwarlike people, and it is the necessary consequence of their luxurious climate.”<sup>6</sup>

More generally, Crawford’s environmentalism focussed on the importance of geographically favourable localities as hotbeds of civilization around the globe – as locations where they were

---

<sup>1</sup>*The British Review and London Critical Journal*, p.330.

<sup>2</sup> See p.329.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.8-9; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.295; the italics are Crawford’s.

<sup>5</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.296. My italics.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.296; Crawford’s italics. See also *Quilty 1998*, p.72 for the same quotation.

particularly prone to prosper.<sup>1</sup> Such sites complied with a set of requirements regarding climate, fecundity of the soil, the extension of the area thus characterized (a certain minimum was deemed necessary), the facility of intercourse along both internal and external lines of communication, the vicinity of other civilizations, etc.. To these were, especially during the 1860s, added an enhanced focus on the racial factor, as well as what with a neologism might be denominated as “ethnobotanics” and “ethnozoology”.<sup>2</sup> Rather than marking a deviance from Crawfurd’s earlier theories, it represented an intensified specialisation within these research fields, at least when compared to conjectural history’s much broader scope. T. Ellingson has remarked how J. Diamond’s project and approach in surprisingly many aspects resembled Crawfurd’s ditto (with the obvious exception of the racial factor, of course): “both are dealing with the same basic question, why some peoples have “advanced” to a state of technological superiority and political dominance over others, and both find their basic answer in a line of analysis that some would call geographic determinism but which seem more accurately characterizable as a kind of ecological opportunism”.<sup>3</sup>

Yet, despite these similarities, one fundamental difference seems to me to clearly demarcate the two approaches; this regards the ‘pre-discursively’ determined placement of the burden of explanation. Given that progress was *naturalised* in conjectural history’s approach and that the present British society constituted the implicit, yet always present, comparative norm, it was hardly surprising that Crawfurd devoted much more attention to the inhibiting, or arresting, factors, than to those that positively abetted the progress of civilization. *It was not progress, but the absence of progress that needed explanation*; compared to contemporary Britain, the rest of the world throughout all of history was by Crawfurd and most of his contemporaries deemed more or less backwards; it was this perceived backwardness that prefigured the actual content of the discourse.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Favourable* was, however, as the example above indicates, a rather ambiguous term; it not only excluded barren regions, such as the Artic zone, but also too fertile (luxurious) regions, such as Java. In the end the most favourable type of locality was unsurprisingly shaped in the image of the familiar climate and circumstances of Northern Europe

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd published 9 articles on these topics during the 1860s, 8 of these (all of them treating the topic of ethnobotanic) during the last two years of his life.

<sup>3</sup> *Ellingson*, p.310.





### 3. From Explaining Race to Racial Explanations: the case of the Eastern Negroes.<sup>1</sup>

Crawfurd's coupling of the physical properties of Man with the composition and characteristics of society implied that the question of race *could* potentially be ascribed a decisive importance. Not merely as a descriptive-evaluative concept, but also as an influential factor that discursively was presented as actively arresting civilization and inhibiting the progress of society. This has often been the interpretation of HIA, given that Crawfurd undoubtedly operated with racial categories in this text,<sup>2</sup> and that chapter I in Book I of it was initiated with the phrase: "There are two aboriginal races of human beings inhabiting the Indian islands, as different from each other as both are from the rest of their species. This is the only portion of the globe which presents so unusual a phenomenon. One of these races may generally be described as a brown-complexioned people, with lank hair, and the other as a black, or rather sooty-coloured race, with woolly or frizzled hair".<sup>3</sup> The latter race was quickly dismissed as "an undistinguished race of savages".<sup>4</sup>

#### 3.1 Explaining Race and Civilization: Causally Linked- or Co-Extensional Entities?

In later historiography this racial division has received an unduly great attention,<sup>5</sup> but within the texts itself it actually carried little weight, simply because outside this chapter I (which was only some 20 p. long), the whole discourse was exclusively dedicated to describing and analysing the past, present, and future of the brown-complexioned race – apart from a few random references to the sooty-coloured race scattered around in the text.

Yet, the "curious fact" of two so distinct races inhabiting the same region, nonetheless, occupied a disproportionately large space in the contemporary reviews. Probably not at least due to its exotic character. There can be no doubt that this topic was a very fashionable one in those days, ever since

---

<sup>1</sup> In the following I use terms like 'negro', 'negroes', etc. without quotation marks. I use these terms because they were the ones used by the authors themselves and which hence appeared in the analysed texts; as such they were deeply embedded in the contemporary social practices and cultural matrices that made up the contemporary knowledge production. It seems to me that to leave them out of the analysis would be to distort the historicist contexts unduly (for more on these matters, see *Livingstone 1998*). Obviously this does *not* imply that I in any way impute these terms with essentialized values, or consider them applicable in any context outside of the historical analysis. The omission of quotation marks is thus primarily aesthetic: if these terms should be bracketed because they are deemed either offensive or merely outdated, then the same would be the case with a whole array of other descriptive-evaluative terms rife then (which repeatedly recur in this dissertation either in historical quotations and references, or as part of my analytical discourse) such as, for instance, 'savage', 'barbarism', 'degenerated', and probably even 'civilization' itself.

<sup>2</sup> And that Crawfurd in his later writings attributed these an essential function as explaining factors; but one should probably be careful not to a priori read Crawfurd's earlier writings too much in the light his later ideas and approaches.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp17-18.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.16.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. in *Quilty 1998* ch.3 and *Knapman 2008a & Knapman 2008b*, and *Manickam 2009b*. *Douglas & Ballard* may be excused in their focus this respect, since "the science of race" actually constitute their primary subject area.

Raffles had brought back to Britain a Papuan boy.<sup>1</sup> The depiction of Dick, as he was named, appeared as an illustration in Raffles' "History of Java", and it was, with some alterations, reused in Crawford's HIA three years later. This interest was not merely of a popular nature, though; it also resulted from- and spurred scientific interest. Within a predominantly environmentalist framework, where climatic differences usually were invoked to account for racial differences, it seemed to defy the logic inherent in this paradigm that the same climate could have produced two so divergent races. This called for an explanation. Especially the presence of a black race in the region seemed baffling, given the usual association of such peoples with the African continent. S.K. Manickam has recently argued how early 19<sup>th</sup> C. discourses, such as Raffles' and Crawford's, were saturated with such references to Africa, notwithstanding whether these were explicitly articulated or not. This resulted in the inscription of these eastern Negroes into three pre-analytical comparative commonplaces; they were thus primarily associated with slavery, directly identified with Africans, or seen as "exotic miniature people", or pigmies<sup>2</sup> – all three commonplaces pointing to a direct or close metaphorical connection with Africa.

This preoccupation with the existence of two so different races within the same geographical space was also reflected in the scathing review of HIA that was published in the Quarterly Review in 1822. Its authors, Sir John Barrow and Sir Stamford Raffles, spent almost five pages in debunking Crawford's version of this 'two-race theory'.<sup>3</sup> Here they also questioned whether these two races actually were "aboriginal" to the region, as claimed by Crawford. In the case of the Malays, they entertained no doubt about their racial affiliation with the Chinese or Tartar race;<sup>4</sup> with regard to black race, a possible connection with Africa was also intimated, although it was never explicitly championed, but instead wrapped in a doubt-generating rhetoric. "We are not prepared to assert, that there is not a considerable difference between the Papuan and African Negro; but we cannot help observing the very striking coincidence which exists between the former and the Caffre of eastern Africa, particularly in the hair, which in both is strongly twisted into small tufts, and differs in this respect from the Negro of Guinea."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On this see Raffles' own account in *Raffles 1817*, Vol.II, p.ccxv. And the reviewer of HIA in *The Literary Gazette* supplemented this with a description of how "since Mr. Crawford wrote, two savages from the Andaman islands have been brought to Penang" (p.338).

<sup>2</sup> *Manickam 2009b*, p.74.

<sup>3</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, pp.113-117.

<sup>4</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, pp.116-117. On the theories regarding a yellow-complexioned Chinese, Mongol, or Tartar race and the ideologically charged terminologies used to denominate it, see *Keevak*; for discussions regarding situation the Malays within this category, see esp. pp.61-69. I will discuss these issues at more length in Part IV.

<sup>5</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, p.115. Within these racialized contexts, hair was often considered just as decisive an indicator of race as the complexion of the skin.

Hence the terminology of race might have been invoked often in HIA, but discursively it carried little weight in the assessment of the civilizational stage of the societies in the Indian Archipelago<sup>1</sup> since from the little that was known of the “Negro race” it seemed that all “the Negroes are in the lowest stage of savage life”.<sup>2</sup> Although a racial explanation of this correlation between race and the savage stage would have been perfectly feasible within this discourse, and although it was held that the “East Insular negro is a distinct variety of the human species, and *evidently a very inferior one*”,<sup>3</sup> the text did not explicitly express any causal explanation for this *categorical co-extensionality*.<sup>4</sup> The discerned discrepancy in civilization between these two races was, as mentioned above, actually explained as resulting from their differences in diet and from the accompanying modes of life, rather than they were perceived as being caused in any direct sense by racial factors.

Another reason for the low number of references to people belonging to this race was the admitted scarcity of reliable information. In 1817 Crawford relied on the description of Major MacInnes, “after Marsden, the best Malay scholar in existence”, handed down to Crawford by an intimate friend, and thus he asserted the he could “vouch in all respect for their [the provided extracts] authenticity”.<sup>5</sup> In 1820, apart from the references to MacInnes and to the Negro brought back to England by Raffles,<sup>6</sup> Crawford referred to Col. Symes’ “Embassy to Ava” (1795)<sup>7</sup> on the Negroes of the Andaman Islands and more hesitatingly to Sonnerat regarding the somewhat tentative proposition that “a more robust people *are said* to occupy New Guinea”.<sup>8</sup> Drawing upon many of the same sources, Prichard had in 1813 stated on the Eastern Negroes that: “Some of these tribes have made advances toward civilization, but by far the greater number are still destitute savages, naked, and without houses, sleeping on trees, and depending for sustenance on the

---

<sup>1</sup> That is, within the different societies in the Indian Archipelago described in HIA; this did not a priori exclude a focus on racial differences between the inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago on the one hand and “outsiders” on the other; Crawford thus often praised the Chinese and their ‘racial qualities’, when comparing these to other Asians. However, given Crawford’s deep scepticism towards earlier European enterprises in the area, a focus on any racial differences between Europeans and inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago was not as pronounced, as might have been expected.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1817b*, p.239.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp.24-25.

<sup>4</sup> Perhaps the closest that he came to articulating this was when he compared the black inhabitants of the Andaman Islands with the lank-haired, brown-complexioned ones of the Nicobares: “In general, whenever the lank and woolly-haired races meet, there is a marked and wonderful inferiority in the latter.” (HIA, Vol.I, p.25) This assertion was stated in a footnote to the text, and, as mentioned, it was not followed up upon.

<sup>5</sup> Both from *Crawford 1817b*, p.239.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp.23-24. On the Negro brought back by Raffles, and on the illustration of him opposed to a “Native of Bali”, in HIA, Vol.I, p.16 & 17, see *Boon 1990* and *Quilty 1998* (this illustration is reprinted on the cover of both of these books).

<sup>7</sup> This was one of the texts included in Quilty’s analysis in *Quilty 1998*.

<sup>8</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp.26-27. On Sonnerat, see also *Stocking 1973*, p.cxli. In this context Crawford also referred to Forrest who in 1779 had published a widely read account of his travels in this area, which Crawford, however, disliked: “Forrest, who had good opportunities of observing them, is as usual most unsatisfactory”. (Chapter 6-10 in *Forrest* deal with New Guinea). See also *Marshall & Williams* p. 79, and *Keay 1991*, p.357.

spontaneous fruits of the earth”.<sup>1</sup> Later, in 1834, while still maintaining that they “upon the whole are among the most diminutive, puny, and ill-favoured of the human species”, Crawford nonetheless seemed to rehabilitate Sonnerat’s assertion, towards which he had before been quite sceptical, when he claimed that on “the great island of New Guinea” “for the first time they are seen with some approach towards civilization”.<sup>2</sup>

My interpretation here is thus quite at odds with S.K. Manickam’s. Not only did she argue that Crawford continued to insist on the puny, pigmy-like character of *all* the negroes in the region, including the Papuans on New Guinea,<sup>3</sup> but that he did so in order to translate their tiny stature “into deficiencies in other areas of civilisation”, and, furthermore, to allow “him to draw from the stereotype of pigmies as being African”.<sup>4</sup> The discursive inclination in HIA was more bent on explaining the progress, or the inhibition, of civilization in terms of diet rather than race (this only came later), and at no time did Crawford even suggest that these people may have originated in Africa; on the contrary, he vehemently and continuously insisted on their aboriginality, and this actually constituted, as seen, one of the main points of contestation against him in his own time.

### **3.2 From Eastern Negro to Eastern Negroes: Racial Classification and Gradual Civilization.**

In the article from 1834 Crawford did for the first time intimate the possible, and even probable, *existence of an aboriginal third race in the archipelago* as well, viz. “an intermediate between the yellow complexioned and the Negrito”,<sup>5</sup> but definitely not the result of an intermixture between

---

<sup>1</sup> Prichard 1813, p.258. Prichard, who never himself visited these zones, relied especially on Forrest, Dr. Leyden’s article from 1810 in *Asiatick Researches* (will be discussed much more later, see also Trautmann 2006, pp.86-96), and the mandatory references to Dampier’s *Voyages* (also rife in Crawford’s texts). It is interesting how, despite nurturing exactly opposite opinions on the questions of the origin of man, mankind’s dissemination, and the essence of races, both ended up with almost the same conclusion in this specific instance. There was a clear causal linkage between race and the obtained level of civilization in Prichard’s *early discourse*: civilization was considered the cause and race the effect, that is, a changeable entity – the more advanced man became the paler his skin got. A disturbing problem in this theory was however that, given its strictly monogenist premise, combined with the assumptions of general progress and its ‘bleaching’ effect upon the colour of the skin, it seemed to indicate that Adam necessarily must have been black! This caused great consternation, also for the Quaker Prichard himself. (On this, see Livingstone 1992b, esp. pp. 16-17, and Livingstone 2008, pp.119-121). However, as emphasized by B. Douglas, soon after “Prichard had rapidly shelved his early thesis that ‘the primitive stock of men were Negroes’. In the third edition of *Researches* (1836-1847), he reinscribed without comment the scurrilous racial terminology and discriminations of his (often French) sources and in the process essentialized the characters of certain races in very negative terms” (Douglas & Ballard, p.42). So, although Prichard was still staunchly “refuting the polygenist heresy”, in the course of time and in concurrence with the general trends “Prichard’s division into classes became steadily more racialized”, and it tended to normalize the “invidious terminology and discriminations” (Douglas & Ballard, p.133).

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.379.

<sup>3</sup> For more on the term *Papua*, its meanings and connotations as well their wider contexts, see Gelpke. See also Moore for more on the *Alfuros*, and Douglas 2010 for a general assessment of the epistemological preconditions, spatial configurations, and ideological implications of the coining and application of such terminologies

<sup>4</sup> Manickam 2009b, p.84. See also p.77.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.406. Here the term ‘Negrito’ is apparently used generically to denominate all the sooty-coloured peoples of the region, and not, as it was often the case, to solely describe the hunter-gatherer societies of ‘diminutive’, black people inhabiting certain zones in the region north of the Equator, viz. the Andamans (‘Negrito’), parts of the interior of the Malayan peninsula (‘Samang’), and some of the northern islands of the Philippines (‘Aetas’, or ‘Negrito’

these two.<sup>1</sup> Except from the categorical, yet unsubstantiated, dismissal of the possibility of “racial admixture” as being the cause for the existence of this third race, the whole discourse enwrapping the existence of it was still, nonetheless, imbued with doubt-suggestive terms as “two, indeed most probably of three, distinct races of men” and “with respect to the third race, if such it really be”.<sup>2</sup>

W. von Humboldt remarked upon this possibility the following year<sup>3</sup> that “research leaves it doubtful whether they should be regarded, with Crawford, as a third race, or with Marsden, as a mixture of the other two.” Given that the evidence adduced from their physical appearance (stature, curliness of hair, and complexion of the skin)<sup>4</sup> did not provide any conclusive evidence, Humboldt suggested that linguistic evidence might provide the answer to this vexed question, if only it could be procured; if spoken language was of a mixed nature as well,<sup>5</sup> then this would count decidedly in favour of the hypotheses of racial mixture. “It remains, in general, an important question, though on information so far available it can scarce admit of a satisfactory solution, as to how far older and deeper minglings of the white and black races may have occurred in these regions, and how far they may have occasioned gradual transitions in language, and even in colour and growth of hair”.<sup>6</sup>

Crawford reiterated the existence of a physically distinct third race in 1856; this was by now, however, ascribed the hybrid appellation, the ‘Negro-Malayan Race’; apart from its apparently characteristic physical appearance, this race was specified through criteria which referred to geographical, ‘cultural’, and civilizational aspects.<sup>7</sup> Although still critical towards the idea, he nonetheless here discussed the possibility of this third race being the result of admixture between the two races which composed the name (if not necessarily the essence) of this third one. Yet he ended with discarding the admixture hypothesis on the grounds of the following evidence: 1) an assumed lack of historical precedence of such occurrences in the region; 2) an allegedly inveterate repugnance between the two races that would hardly be conducive towards interbreeding on the grand scale necessary for the creation of such a large group of independent societies as the ones evidently existent amongst this third race – this was allegedly demonstrated by the fact that on the islands where people of the Malayan race occupied the coastal zones and the negro race inhabited

---

– the Spanish diminutive form of ‘Negro’). Apart from the descriptions and analyses in Crawford’s writings, see also especially *Earl 1853*, chapters 7-10.

<sup>1</sup> *Crawford 1834a*, p.379. Once more it was stated that: “The existence of these three distinct races of men, inhabiting one and the same country, is a strange and singular phenomenon.”

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1834a*, pp.378 & 406.

<sup>3</sup> W. von Humboldt died in 1835, and his magnum opus “Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java” was published posthumously from 1836-39 (parts of it had been published earlier); to the first was attached the book length introduction, “The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the mental Development of Mankind”, from which this comment is taken.

<sup>4</sup> “körperlicher Bildung, Krausheit der Haare und farbe der Haut”. (*Humboldt 1836*, Vol.I p.vii)

<sup>5</sup> Humboldt’s linguistic theories, incl. the idea of mixed languages, will be discussed more at length in Parts III & IV.

<sup>6</sup> *Humboldt 1836*, Vol.I p.vii (the translation is from Humboldt 1988, p.15)

<sup>7</sup> The entry ‘Negro-Malayan Race’, *Crawford 1856*, pp.296-297.

the interior, there were no indications of this ever having produced any independent society of peoples of a hybrid origin;<sup>1</sup> and 3) with regard to the spatial divisions of geography “the line of demarcation which separates the Negro-Malayan race from the Malayan to the west, and from the Negro to the east, is sufficiently well defined. It may even be remarked, that it is the inhabitants of the islands which are nearest to those inhabited by the Malayan race,..., that most nearly approach to the Negro character, while it is those of the islands nearest to New Guinea,..., that partake least [most?] of the Malay, *the very of what would have been the case from an admixture of the two races.*”<sup>2</sup>

Although not referring explicitly to G.W. Earl’s writings in this instance, it seems probable that Crawfurd nonetheless was aware of these when he presented this ‘evidence’ in support of his own hypothesis on the existence of an autochthonous third race in the region. Crawfurd referred to Earl various times in his “Descriptive Dictionary”, but it was always in his capacity as an acute observer and provider of valuable and reliable information, not as an accomplished theorist in his own right.<sup>3</sup> Earl had, however, discussed at length and then dismissed the possibility of the existence of an autochthonous third race in the region in his “The Native races of the Indian Archipelago: Papuans”, published three years earlier. Given that Crawfurd had referred to this work in other instances in his “Descriptive Dictionary”, it would be odd, if he was not acquainted with Earl’s views on this topic, and probably had them in mind too, when he presented his evidence against the admixture hypothesis (points 1-2) and in favour of his own (point 3).<sup>4</sup> Earl had touched upon this topic several times in this book, and he had suggested that “the island of Timor contains within itself materials which may possibly *enable the scientific ethnologist* to decide whether the variety of complexion met with in the Indian Archipelago *has from a mixture of races, or from natural development connected with the mode of life adopted by different tribes*”.<sup>5</sup> That is, did these societies in possession of such “intermediary physical” features result from racial intermixture

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd did not discuss the possibility of a relatively late arrival of these people of the Malayan race, and where intermingling on such a large scale would consequently not have had time to evolve in a sufficiently large degree to create independent societies populated by the progeny of such intermixture.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawfurd 1856*, pp.296-297; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. *Crawfurd 1856*, pp. 330 (“Mr. Windsor Earl has given the following very satisfactory account of...”), 331 (“... is thus well described by Mr. Windsor Earl”), 378 (“Mr. Windsor Earl who visited them, describes...”), 440 (“This is the account given by Mr. Windsor Earl); the only exception to this use of Earl as solely a provider of information occurred on p.295 (“it is confirmed by Mr. Windsor East [Earl], *a writer who, by his knowledge and experience of these races, is by far the most competent judge*”). (My italics). Crawfurd also only referred to Earl as a provider of information in the introductory dissertation to his grammar and Dictionary of Malay from 1852; see *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, pp.xcvii, xcvi, c, cii, clx, clxi, cciv. Ballard stressed that “Earl’s lasting reputation as a field observer conceals a nice irony, however. He read voraciously and ‘pumped’ other travellers, ... I can find no evidence that Earl ever actually laid eyes, or set foot, on New Guinea.” (*Douglas & Ballard*, p.174)

<sup>4</sup> This assertion appears to be corroborated by the fact that both Earl and Crawfurd in this particular context referred to the same anonymously written article entitled “Short Account of Timor, Rotti, Savu, salor, &c.” published in Moor’s “notices of the Indian Archipelago” (1837). (*Moor*, Appendix, pp.5-12). Based on circumstantial evidence Earl tentatively ascribed authorship of the article to a certain “Mr. Francis, a native of Madras” (*Earl 1853*, p.180).

<sup>5</sup> *Earl 1853*, p.179; my italics.

between the Malay and the Papuan races, or should it rather be explained as differences plotted along a gradual scale of races and as a direct cause of climatic and other environmental factors? Crawford's hypothesis of the existence of a third race did not appear to have been seriously considered here. In the end he seemed to have opted for the admixture hypothesis and relied on a *prima facie* established existence of two easily distinguishable races of the Malayu-Polynesians and the Papuans,<sup>1</sup> instead of the hypothesis of gradually converging races. Writing on the islands of the Moluccan Sea, which in Crawford's theory comprised the central zone occupied by the third race, Earl likewise identified the existence of "a mixed race"; however, he ascribed the origin of this to "a fact which is readily explained by the circumstance of Papuan slaves, to the annual amount of hundreds and even thousands, having been exported from New Guinea to the westward for ages past",<sup>2</sup> and this was a process that continued even into Earl's own time.<sup>3</sup> In it is this context that the first two, hardly convincing points in Crawford's rhetoric – viz. the assumed absence of historical precedence, and the alleged repugnance towards cross-racial breeding amongst both races – make some sense: in a quite direct manner these assertions actually addressed and pretended to refute two central points in Earl's earlier argument.

Despite the association between civilization and race on a global scale, such as it was stressed by Crawford in 1834,<sup>4</sup> the emphasis in the context of the Oceanic region was, nonetheless, still focussed on the "wide difference in the *degrees of civilization* attained by different *tribes and nations* of the vast region"<sup>5</sup> of Oceania; this implied that further references to other peoples than those belonging to the yellow complexioned race were actually, as already mentioned, quite sparse.

In the 1850s it was once more maintained that:

"The oriental Negro is ever found in a state of civilization below that of the brown-complexioned and lank-haired race in their neighbourhood, whether these be Malayan or Polynesian. There is a great diversity in their civilization; some with the least possible knowledge of the commonest arts of life, live precariously on the spontaneous produce of their forests and waters, both animal and vegetable; while others practice a *rude husbandry*, *construct boats*, and undertake *coasting voyages* for the fishing of the tortoise and tripang or holothurion."<sup>6</sup>

This progress in civilization amongst some of the Oriental Negroes was allegedly most prominent on the Western coast of New Guinea. Civilization had left its imprint upon the societies

---

<sup>1</sup> See also *Earl 1850*.

<sup>2</sup> *Earl 1853*, p.68.

<sup>3</sup> See also *Manickam 2009b*, pp.74-77 for a discussion of what it implied to perceive these eastern negroes through the institution of slavery which also served as an (unconscious) analytical commonplace in most of these discourses.

<sup>4</sup> See part 1.3 in this Part.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawford 1834a*, p.379. My italics.

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1852b*, p.87, and *Crawford 1853*, p.176 (the two texts are identical).

in this area in the shape of the people being in possession of “good dwellings, are decently closed, have large rowing and sailing vessels, a knowledge of iron, a little agriculture, and two domestic animals, the hog and the dog”. These improvements were, however not procured by these societies themselves, but had been derived from strangers as “attested by the evidence of language”. Furthermore, “as we proceed eastward, or remove to a distance from the nations of the western part of the Archipelago, the tribes of New Guinea becomes more and more barbarous”.<sup>1</sup> This more diversified view on the scope of civilization within the societies of the non-yellow complexioned part of the population in the Indian Archipelago was however not solely explained as a result of appropriation of elements of civilization from the yellow-complexioned race; it was also accompanied by *an augmentation in the number of races*, putatively inhabiting the region. In 1856 Crawford thus stated that: “In our inadequate knowledge, it is very difficult to determine the varieties of the human race that exist within the Malay and Philippine Archipelagos, but I imagine they are not fewer than five, that number into which some writers on the natural history of Man would fain compress all the inhabitants of the earth. These are the race of which the Malay nation is the type; the Sâ mang, or dwarf negroes of the Malay peninsula; the Negritos, or Aetas, of the Philippines; the large negroes or Papuas of New Guinea, and a race intermediate between the these last and the Malayan, which may be called the Negro-Malay.”<sup>2</sup> It will here be noticed that this enhanced number has been obtained by splitting the race of the eastern Negro into three separate racial groups, defined by physical traits and demarcated by clear-cut geographical boundaries, and these groups seemingly coincided neatly with different steps on the ascending ladder of civilization. Thus, the entry on the “Negro” stated:

“In point of *capacity*, tested by *social advancement*, there is an immense difference between the different negro races. The negroes of the Andamans [not mentioned in the racial enumeration in the entry on “Man”] are *abject savages*, in no way superior to the Australians, and, indeed, hardly on a level with them; and those of the Malay Peninsula and the Philippines are *erratic savages*... Most of the negroes of New Guinea, on the contrary, have fixed habitations, some knowledge of agriculture, and have domesticated the hog; and those of the Fejee group in the Pacific are on par with the most civilized of the brown Polynesian race.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> All quotations from *Crawford 1856*, the entry on New Guinea, pp.297-300 (p.299). “Barbarous” shall probably here be interpreted in its loose sense, as synonymous with savagery. An alike description could be encountered in *Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, p.clxiii, on the various states of civilization amongst the Negroes of New Guinea; the more advanced were characterized by dwelling in “huge barn-like houses raised on posts, like those of the wild inhabitants of Borneo, but *ruder*”; they had “a *rude* agriculture”, understood “a *rude* navigation”, possessed domesticated hogs and fowls (note the discrepancy in the mentioned animals!), and practised a rudimentary trade to procure various necessities (my italics).

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1856*; on the entry on “Man”, pp.259-264. (p.259)

<sup>3</sup> *Crawford 1856*, entry on “Negro”, pp.294-296 (p.296) (My italics)



It appears almost as if the more diversified picture of these people, a result of an increased knowledge of these societies, produced a narrational need for the introduction of more races in Crawford's discourse. Apart from merely reflecting an increased knowledge of – as well as an intensified interest in observing, measuring, and classifying – the biologically heterogeneous features of the societies composed by the negroes in the region, the soaring in the number of (classified) races also provided a ready-made explanative factor that could account for the growing number of subdivisions in the levels of civilization that was discerned amongst these societies. In the words of C. Ballard "Crawford's physical and moral gradient for the Indian Archipelago maps racial difference and social evolution in space".<sup>1</sup> Yet one should be careful with not reading too much rigour and precision into these discourses on race, and especially not in Crawford's case; despite being clad in a purportedly scientific attire, the terminology on race remained lax and plastic, even if some of the underlying principles, and to a certain degree the accompanying definition criteria, appear to have become ever more rigidified. But the use of the term 'race' was still very loose, at times even contradictory, and the identified number of races oscillated, even within Crawford's own discourses. Thus in his article "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races" from 1848 Crawford stated that in the Indian Archipelago and in the Pacific:

"It will appear that there are *no fewer than five distinct races of the brown-complexioned and lank-haired family*; and, without including Madagascar and Australia, and supposing all those to the north of the equator to be identical, *not less than eight of that of the oriental negro*. As far, then, as *physical form* is concerned it is certain enough that *none of these widely scattered races could have sprung from one and the same stock*, as has been imagined; yet, in most of the many tongues spoken by them, whether brown or negro, traces of a Malayan language are to be found."<sup>2</sup>

So, although operating here with at least a staggering 13 different races, defined in terms of their physical form and mainly, but not exclusively, distinguished on that basis of biological criteria, Crawford's discourse nonetheless maintained a dichotomous distinction between the brown-complexioned and lank haired family and the negroes.<sup>3</sup> Any genealogical linking of a common descent of these physically determined races was explicitly denied, and instead an intimated

---

<sup>1</sup> Ballard, in ch.3 in *Douglas & Ballard*.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1848a*, p.337-338; my italics. However, with regard to the brown-complexioned and lank haired family, Crawford seemed only to enumerate four different races: 1) the 'true Malay', 2) the abovementioned 3<sup>rd</sup>, or 'intermediate' race, 3) the inhabitants of what in these days became known as Micronesia, and 4) as Polynesia.

<sup>3</sup> Although still asserting the existence of "an aboriginal third race in the region", its analytical importance was in this article diluted by being explicitly subsumed into the group of the brown-complexioned and lank haired family (despite being characterized by, amongst other elements, their crisp and curled hair that was neither lank nor frizzled and woolly) as composing yet another subset. This racial group however regained some of its analytic importance in *Crawford 1856* which, with its smaller geographical scope, did not include any of the brown-complexioned races inhabiting the Pacific.

biological polygenism was present in all but name in the text.<sup>1</sup> On a supra-racial level Crawford's discourse thus operated with the existence of two larger categories of 1) the brown-complexioned and lank haired Malay and Polynesian, and 2) the woolly-haired negro; these were each bestowed the – given Crawford's rejection of any genealogical ties, rather ironic – denomination *families*. And in all important aspects these two 'families' seemed to be equipped with essential rather merely classificatory and conventionally attributed qualities.<sup>2</sup> Despite such discursive uncertainties in Crawford's later discourses on race, it seems evident, however, that there was a much more explicit trend towards preferring racialism as a decisive explanative mode when describing the sooty-coloured, or negro, peoples, than when delineating the civilizational trajectories of the rest of the inhabitants belonging to the yellow-, or brown-complexioned inhabitants in the region.

Thus, when devising the greater civilizational scheme in his "Descriptive Dictionary", the racial concept had only a marginal role to play. "The question of race may soon be dismissed. Whatever is entitled to be called civilisation has originated with the brown, lank-haired, or Malay race."<sup>3</sup> Even if race was considered the most decisive element when determining the causes of civilizational disparity among different societies, it would still in this context constitute a too crude analytical tool when the disparities between the various *civilized* societies in the region had to be explained; race was irrelevant rather than outright invalid here. Instead Crawford fell back on more environmentalist explanations, and among the causes which have "contributed to the disparity of civilisation" "the most material are certainly, differences in the quality of the localities they happen to occupy".<sup>4</sup>

However, in his analysis of the Negro societies inhabiting the region Crawford applied a deviating approach. Crawford's 'introduction' of a third, allegedly autochthonous, race in his article from 1834 initiated a tentative deconstruction of the rigid racial dichotomy between the yellow-, or brown-complexioned and sooty-coloured races. This analytical move appears to have been inspired by recent French theories that were framed in the wake of several large naval and scientific expeditions visiting these areas during the 1820s.<sup>5</sup> Crawford himself mentioned the Parisian geographer-linguist A. Balbi as one the sources for his geographical divisions of the region. Before 1834 this racial dichotomy had been reigning rather unchallenged in British discourses since it, in

---

<sup>1</sup> I discuss the changes and continuities in Crawford's racial theories and his positioning within the monogenism-polygenism debates more at length in especially Part IV of this dissertation.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout all of his career Crawford operated within the episteme of fixist creation (*Livingstone 2008*, pp.135-36); it was from this standpoint that he later reviewed Darwin's "Origin of the Species" and engaged in a debate on the antiquity of man with T. Huxley.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawford 1856*, entry on "Man", p.259.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1856*, entry on "Man", p.259. He would elaborate much more on this topic in the 1860s, especially, but not exclusively, in *Crawford 1863a*.

<sup>5</sup> These expeditions, their scientific results, as well as their epistemic and ideological preconditions has been analyzed in especially *Douglas & Ballard*, chapters 1-2 and in *Staum*.

the context of the Pacific, had been devised by C. de Brosses in mid 18<sup>th</sup> C., and it was further confirmed as an analytical commonplace through J.R. Forster's very influential writings.<sup>1</sup> Crawford paved the way for new analytical possibilities by introducing this third race; simultaneously he acknowledged its intermediary character and still emphasized its autochthonous status as composing an autonomous and essential entity ontologically on par with the two other races, even though his own hyphenated nomenclature seemed to undermine this assertion. Crawford continued, as already sketched, by discursively privileging the temporalised version of stadial civilization along the lines of conjectural history within his general referential framework; it was apparently civilization rather than race that he primarily set out to explain. Yet in terms of explaining the levels of civilization obtained by the various, often recently discovered and only patchy described, negro societies in the Indian Archipelago and its vicinity, Crawford increasingly took recourse to a spatialised notion of race. In this analytical grid, racial differences could be either explained by 1) basically multiplying the number of identified, purportedly autonomous races in the region rather than 2) assuming a gradual transition between the different races, such as the avowed monogenists Prichard and Latham did,<sup>2</sup> or 3) like Earl, and later A.R. Wallace,<sup>3</sup> operating with a rigid racial dichotomy where intermediary forms were explained as instances of intermixture between the two main races. Crawford's approach was closely connected with his increasingly outspoken polygenetic inclinations,<sup>4</sup> and it facilitated an explanation of divergences in the obtained level of civilization amongst the various described societies as merely being the effect of racial differences; racial differences which assumedly implied discrepant innate capacities as well, and hence these affected the potential for civilization crucially.

Whereas many chastised Crawford's alleged polygenetic leanings, I have not been able to encounter much criticism of his explanatory mode per se – viz. of his accounting for differences in the complexion of the skin *and* in the achieved level of the civilization by merely multiplying the number of races. This mushrooming of races present in the Indian Archipelago and adjacent areas was, however, addressed in an article on the "Customs Common to the Hill Tribes Bordering on Assam and Those of the Indian Archipelago" published in the JIA. Most probably authored by J.R. Logan, the article stated that "Mr. Crawford's view" most of all was "a negation of all hypotheses,

---

<sup>1</sup> See especially *Ryan*, but interesting information and interpretations can also be procured from *Tcherkézoff*, *Douglas* 2005, *Mawyer*, *Carhart*, *Marshall & Williams*, *Liebersohn*, in particular *Douglas & Ballard*. This issue is treated more at length in Part II of this dissertation.

<sup>2</sup> The analytical model suggested here is an elaboration of the one used by Vetter in his analysis of the context of Wallace's conceptualization of a demarcating line between the Papuan and the Malay races (*Vetter* 2006). See also Parts II & IV of this dissertation.

<sup>3</sup> Wallace institutionalised this approach through his meticulous discernment of the demarcation line between the two races (although this is *not* the line that still bears his name and which demarcates the Asian and Austronesian flora and fauna); see Part II for a more thorough analysis of this.

<sup>4</sup> See *Carhart* for an analysis of C. Meiners's late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> C. polygenetic theories with regard to Polynesia.

since it considers each tribe as having come into being in the country where it is found, like the indigenous plants and animals with which it is surrounded.”<sup>1</sup> According to the author, this approach at best represented an initial phase of research, and it ought to be replaced as soon as the growing amount of evidence allowed for more sophisticated modes of explanation that were capable of accounting for the dynamics and the differences *within* a framework of basic unity.<sup>2</sup>

### **3.3 Extent of Information, Degrees of Knowledge, and Explanatory Modes.**

Despite the gaining of an enhanced knowledge of the regions inhabited by these dark races throughout the first half of the nineteenth-century, it was still by and large a terra incognita to the British in terms of the languages and societal traits that these people possessed. Even the more easily accessible features of these people remained epistemologically shrouded in the hazy atmosphere of random encounters and haphazard conjectures.<sup>3</sup> Thus, as late as 1852, Crawford could write that: “of the *physical form and manners* of the various *tribes* of these insular Negroes very little is known, and of their *languages*, we possess only the scraps picked up by voyagers unacquainted with them, and ignorant of any language that might be the medium of forming an acquaintance with them”.<sup>4</sup>

Latham, in his article “Upon the Languages of the Papuan or Negrito Race” from 1843, seemed to opine differently, though; he was at least not afraid of advancing quite bold hypotheses regarding their shared linguistic features which he found were “equally general with the Indo-European”,<sup>5</sup> even though he also had to admit that “many of the above notices indicate the probable rather than the actual presence”<sup>6</sup> of both languages and the peoples themselves. Latham would thus wrongly Negrito tribes as existent on both Sumatra and Borneo.<sup>7</sup>

A glimpse into Crawford’s own references proves to be illuminating. Many of these still referred to evidence gathered during Cook’s circumnavigations almost a century earlier, or to later maritime

---

<sup>1</sup> Logan 1848, pp.229. The article “Customs Common to the Hill Tribes Bordering on Assam and Those of the Indian Archipelago” can be encountered in JIA, Vol.II (1848), pp.229-236. Raffles and Burrow had some 25 years before expressed a very similar evaluation. (*Raffles & Barrow*, p.117)

<sup>2</sup> “However unsatisfactory we may find it”, the author wrote, “we must remember that we have no right to ascribe a foreign derivation to any of these tribes until we have accumulated facts sufficient to counterbalance the fact which lies at the bottom of this opinion.” (*Logan 1848*, pp.229)

<sup>3</sup> See Douglas 2003 for an analysis of the complications associated with such a “seaborne ethnography” and the journey of authoritative information from the precarious encounter on the littoral to the literature and the elaborate theories of the savants in salons.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.clix. My italics. The linguistic sources and the modes of gathering them will be analyzed more in detail in Part III of this dissertation.

<sup>5</sup> Latham 1844, p.54. Latham thus claimed that, from the little that was known, all these languages appeared to be “related to each other, *at least* as the most different languages of the Indo-European tribe are related.”

<sup>6</sup> Latham 1844, p.40.

<sup>7</sup> Latham 1844, p.38.

expeditions, such as those of Freycinet and Dumont D'Urville.<sup>1</sup> These suffered from the same inherent problems as Cook's voyages did: they were large, and often intimidating, expeditions which only devoted a very limited period of time to each locality, and this was in particular the case in the regions inhabited by these negroes.

Even though G.W. Earl would later emphasize how "the information furnished by the Dutch expeditions [during the 1820s and 1830s] is particularly valuable, as they are always *provided with interpreters well experienced in intercourse with the Papuans*".<sup>2</sup> These interpreters more often than not appeared to have had no real knowledge of the diverse languages spoken by these Papuans;<sup>3</sup> as such, they seem to have been more valuable as communicative intermediaries, or cultural brokers, who were well accustomed in the traditions and rituals associated with the establishment of contact and the commencement of communication in this unstable *contact zone*,<sup>4</sup> rather than as translators of the native languages in the strictest sense of this word. Under such circumstances the possibilities of a sustained information gathering were far from optimal. None of the more traditional types of informants were available. These regions had not been colonized and hence no scholar-administrators had yet had the opportunity to interact with- and study these people in order to be able to rule them more efficiently; the trading facilities were meagre, and, as a result, only very few white traders approached these regions, let alone described what they saw in a style sufficiently credible to be relied on by metropolitan savants like Crawfurd;<sup>5</sup> and the great influx of missionaries to these lesser accessible parts of the Pacific rim were yet to come.<sup>6</sup>

The exception in the British context seems to have been G.W. Earl, the author of the acclaimed "The Eastern Seas" from 1837,<sup>7</sup> who, as Crawfurd acknowledged, "saw more of the Negroes than any other Englishman".<sup>8</sup> In 1840 Earl had translated D.H. Kolff's "Voyage of the Dutch Brig of War Dourga", chapters 19 and 20 of which dealt with "the previously unknown southern coast of

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, pp.clix-clxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> Earl 1853, p.12; my italics. See also p.44, and p.67 for examples of such successful communication through the medium of these go-betweens; commenting upon the information gained by a Lt. Bruijn Kops, Earl thus contended that "his information is the more valuable, from the opportunities afforded him, *through the medium of native interpreters* attached to the expedition, for obtaining correct particulars" (p.67, my italics).

<sup>3</sup> As illustrated e.g. on p.25: "and all the attempts of the officers to obtain a close communication with them were unsuccessful; their object being rendered the more difficult by the inability of the Ceramese interpreter to understand the language of these wild bushmen." ('Bushmen' should here obviously be interpreted as a pejorative denomination on par with 'savages' rather than as a generic term alluding to any resemblance with the South African 'Bushmen' ('San')).

<sup>4</sup> On the *contact zone* as an analytical tool in approaching and assessing cross-cultural encounters, Pratt 1992, pp.6-7.

<sup>5</sup> On the British initiatives to include this zone into their commercial sphere through the (failed) establishment of trading entropots on Melville Island and Port Essington on the northern coast of Australia, see Graham, pp.402-443. G.W. Earl played a pivotal role in these enterprises.

<sup>6</sup> On these later missionaries, see e.g. Brock, pp.138-141.

<sup>7</sup> For the reception of this work, see Turnbull's *Introduction* to the reprint of this work. (Turnbull 1971, pp.v-xviii) Oddly enough, Ballard did not mention this important work, and instead he stated that Earl's translation of Kolff's Dutch text was "his first major work" (in Douglas & Ballard, p.172). See also Gibson-Hill, Jones 1973, Jones 1994, and Reece 1982,

<sup>8</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, p.clxi. This acknowledgment is also mentioned by Ballard in Douglas & Ballard, p.173.

New Guinea”; and before this he had published several articles on both his own journeys as well as reviews of Dutch travelogues from the area in both the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (JRAS) and the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society (JRGS).<sup>1</sup> Earl had also himself visited these areas, and later he had articles published on these matters in the Singapore based “Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia” (JIA), before issuing a monograph on the topic entitled “The Native Races of the Indian Archipelago: Papuans” in 1853. The anthropological information contained in this book actually provided what was deemed as reliable information and interpretation on these people right up to the end of the nineteenth-century.<sup>2</sup>

### **3.4 Conclusion.**

The diachronic changes and consistencies in Crawfurd’s theories on the nature and civilizational level of the dark-skinned people in the Indian Archipelago sketched here seem to suggest that, although an unequivocal, and mainly physically based, racial concept saturated all of his texts throughout the entire period, its analytical function *within* these texts nevertheless changed markedly. In Crawfurd’s earlier texts there was a clear *co-extensionality* between those groups of people who were defined as Negroes, or sooty-coloured, in the region, and a low level of civilization, both in relative and in absolute terms. But the correlation in extension between these two categories was not explained further. Crawfurd was from the onset either a latent polygenist, or at least circumventing the Biblical question of the genealogy of the whole of Mankind, and later he became an outspoken polygenist; this implied that the multitude of races did not present the same problem to him as it did to the strict monogenist Prichard. Prichard had initially had asserted that race was a causal effect of the obtained level of civilization, and not vice versa as it tended to happen later in the nineteenth century, even within Prichard’s own discourses.<sup>3</sup> Instead Crawfurd tended to explain the level of civilization as a consequence of primarily environmentalist factors; something in which he proved to be remarkably consistent. However, at least by the 1850s race had changed from being mainly a descriptive concept – albeit always applied in very derogatory terms when dealing with the Eastern Negroes – to attain a much more active, or civilizational prescriptive, function in Crawfurd’s discourses; this counted for the case examined here, within the Indian Archipelago, but the same patterns could be detected when he described other geographical areas as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amongst these were reviews of Kolff’s book and of J. Modera’s “Narrative of a Voyage along the S.W. coast of New Guinea” in 1828; both of these provided a substantial part of the source-material in his book on the Papuans from 1853.

<sup>2</sup> P.174 in *Douglas & Ballard*.

<sup>3</sup> On the changes and consistencies in Prichard’s theories on the common origin and racial diversity of man, see *Stocking* 1973, *Stocking* 1987, *Augstein* 1996, *Augstein* 1999, and *Douglas & Ballard* (chapter 2).

This racial factor was much more evident when describing the Eastern Negroes than when analysing the societies inhabited by the yellow- or brown-complexioned peoples like the Malays. The former group seems thus to have been much firmer embedded in what D. Arnold has called the *trope of scientific tropicality* which, when analysing human societies, tended to stress more their nature than their culture. Discursively their nature was equated with the predominant perceptions of the tropical nature: as primordial, either in the paradisiacal interpretation of this or in its primitive and savage contrast.<sup>1</sup> This implied that it became even more scientifically viable to perceive some societies as historically conditioned and hence prone to develop, while others were ascribed to mainly belong to the more static, and indeed time-less, realms of nature.

The racialised, spatial divide existing within Crawford's discourses throughout the entire period dealt with here – between the dark-skinned people of the eastern part of the Indian Archipelago and the Malay societies inhabiting the western part – was thus perfectly concordant with D. Arnold's analytical model sketched above. However, in this case, part of this discrepancy within both Crawford's analytical approach and the corollary explanative factors that he invoked should probably also be attributed to the heuristic fact that, in the absence of reliable source-material (in the shape of credible observations, prolonged interaction with these people, etc.), recourse had to be taken to the other methodologies focussing on the more biological aspects firmly grounded in the natural history of Man. It seemed given that a 'research' based almost purely on such an approach was more or less predetermined to emphasise the apparently unchanging aspects of Man's nature over the achievements of his culture.

---

<sup>1</sup> Arnold 2005, see esp. pp.110-115.





## **Part II. Space, Time, Movement.**

### **Geographical Configurations, Historical Periods, and the Travelling Gaze.**

“We (in the sense of human beings) travel and explore the world, carrying with us some “background books”. These need not accompany us physically; the point is that we travel with preconceived notions of the world, derived from our cultural tradition. In a very curious case we travel knowing in advance what we are supposed to discover.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Eco 1998, p.54.



# 1. Twixt Asia and Oceania: Negotiating the Geographical Place of the 'Indian Archipelago' in British Discourses.

## 1.1 *Between India and the Deep Blue Sea: An Early Debate.*

When Sir William Jones on Feb. 24, 1791 read his VIII. Discourse before the Asiatick Society in Calcutta, his speeches on “the principal nations<sup>1</sup> who have peopled the continent and islands of Asia”<sup>2</sup> had reached to the people on the rim of Asia; these were characterised as “the Borderers, Mountaineers, and Islanders of Asia”.<sup>3</sup> Amongst these the so-called *Indian islands* stood out as being – in contrast to the “wild tribes” residing in the other border regions – populated predominantly by what Jones described as “the *more civilized inhabitants* of the islands annexed by geographers to their Asiatic division of this globe”.<sup>4</sup> However, it was not only the geographers who inscribed this region within the realms of Asia:<sup>5</sup> so did Jones too – and this in terms of denoting, of defining, as well as of devising the historical essence of the geographical zone in question.<sup>6</sup> The chosen name itself, the *Indian islands*, suggested the obvious linkage between these islands and India.<sup>7</sup> Jones thus stated that “India, then, on its most enlarged scale, in which the ancients appear to have understood it” was “divided on the west from Persia by the Arachosian mountains, limited on the east by the Chinese part of the farther peninsula,<sup>8</sup> confined on the north by the wilds of Tartary, and extending to the south as far as the Isles of Java”,<sup>9</sup> the latter being synonymous with the Indian islands. Hence these islands seemed to comprise the spatial boundary of the geographical location of India; in the human geography of Asia delineated by Jones, the notion of *India* occupied the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jones enumerated these as being composed of the following five nations: Arabia, Persia, India, China, and Tartary. All of these were supposed to have originated from either the Indian, Arabian, or Tartarian *primitive stock* (See e.g. *Jones 1824*, Vol.1 pp.129-130. For an analysis of these ethnographic aspects of Sir W. Jones’s theories, see *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, esp. pp.129-140 and *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.28-61.

<sup>2</sup> From his “Discourse IV”, in *Jones, 1824*, p.38 (My italics).

<sup>3</sup> *Jones 1824*, Vol.I, p.129.

<sup>4</sup> *Jones 1824*, Vol.I, p.130. My italics.

<sup>5</sup> As well known, the notion of the ‘East Indies’, or ‘India extra/ultra gangem’, had a long and cogent prehistory, stretching back at least to Ptolemy. For a brief description of “a spatial history of ‘India’ to 1780”, see *Edney*, pp.3-9. For an examination of some of these terms in various European languages, see *Emmerson*, pp.2-4.

<sup>6</sup> In his classical work on “The Zulu Zone” J.F. Warren described a *zone* as “created through the intersections of geography, culture, and history” (*Warren 1981/2007*, p.xxvii); it is precisely the entwined relationship between these three features that I intend to explore in the following.

<sup>7</sup> In his IX. and X. Discourses Jones situated both India and the rest of the world within a *genealogical framework* on the scale of universal history, and which ultimately traced all origins back to the Biblical description of the dispersions of the descendants of Noah after the Deluge (see *Jones 1824*, Vol.2 pp.1-35). This is what Trautmann has dubbed as Jones’s “Mosaic ethnology”. *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.37-61.

<sup>8</sup> I.e. what is nowadays called the Malayan peninsula.

<sup>9</sup> *Jones 1824*, Vol.1 p.24; for a similar approach, see also p.39. On the notions of Java as designating either Sumatra, or subsidiary the whole archipelago, see *Crawfurd 1856* (entries of *Java*, *Sumatra*, and *Polo, Marco*); see also *Wallis*.

central position, and as such it played a centripetal function in defining the other Asian regions; these were mainly defined in terms of their assumed connections to India.<sup>1</sup>

Nowhere was this pattern more pronounced than in the case of the Indian islands; not only were these closely affiliated with India, but they were also clearly considered subjected and subsidiary to it. To Jones the vestiges of civilization present on the Indian islands had evidently emanated from India, and just as Taprobane (Ceylon) for which “we know *from the languages, letters, religion, and old monuments* of its various inhabitants, was peopled by the Hindu race”, it was by the same token adduced that “nor can we doubt that the same enterprising *family* planted colonies in the other isles of the same ocean from the Malay-adwipás, which take their name from the mountain of Malaya, to the Moluccas or Mallicás, and probably far beyond them”.<sup>2</sup> But if India in both name, definition, and historical perspective could be perceived to extend to, and include, the so-called Indian islands that stretched at least to the Moluccas, “and probably far beyond them”, then this begged the question of what lay beyond the mental horizon of India: where did Asia end, and where did the much fabled South Seas begin?

This latter region was in these days being charted by the various expeditions sent out by France, Great Britain, and Spain and led by the likes of Bougainville, Cook, and Malaspina. The epistemological impact of these expeditions and the implementation of new scientific paradigms that followed in their wake can hardly be overestimated; indeed, it has been argued that “it was the extension of these scientific methods of *observation, classification, and comparison to peoples* and to nature that made geography [as a consistent concept and as a demarcated discipline] possible”.<sup>3</sup>

The intriguing question of determining the boundaries of Asia in general, and of India in particular, had been addressed 10 years before by the then rather unknown former EIC employee at Bencoolen in Sumatra William Marsden.<sup>4</sup> After his return from Sumatra, Marsden sought Sir Joseph Banks’s patronage and ended up as a trusted member of the inner core around Banks.<sup>5</sup> During one of the subsequent breakfast sessions, one of the topics they discussed “was that of the languages of Eastern and South-sea Islands, to which Mr. Banks, during his voyage in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Judged from the overall structure of Jones’s 11 “Discourses” it seems that he apparently operated with three general organizing principles of the (human) space: 1) the intra-Asian space discursively revolving around the notion of India, as described here; 2) the universal framework of a Mosaic ethnology where ‘India’, and not at least Sanskrit (the assumed closest living remnant of the surmised proto-Indo European language), played a crucial part; and 3) a dichotomy between the “western and eastern worlds” along a traditional orientalist divide. It, however, has to be stressed here that Jones himself neither necessarily attributed a negative value to the eastern, or oriental, nor did he assume that this divide was insurmountable – the very idea an Indo-European language group testified to this.

<sup>2</sup> *Jones 1824*, Vol.1 p.138. My italics.

<sup>3</sup> *Withers & Livingstone 1999*, p.1. See also e.g. *Marshall & Williams*, pp.258-298; *Gascoigne*, esp. pp.119-183; and *Libersohn*’s recent mapping of the European enterprise of the discovery and positioning of the Pacific. My italics.

<sup>4</sup> On Marsden, see the entry in the ODNB (*Cook*), *Carroll 2002* and *Carroll 2011*, *Gascoigne 1994* (esp. pp.163-169), and of course also his memoirs in *Marsden 1838*.

<sup>5</sup> See *Marsden 1838*, pp.44-46.

*Endeavour*, had paid much attention”. Upon these matters Marsden “addressed to him [Banks] a short treatise (drawn up for the occasion), which some time after appeared in the *Archæologia*.”<sup>1</sup> In this short article, published in the 6<sup>th</sup> volume of “*Archæologia*” in 1782,<sup>2</sup> Marsden undertook a linguistic comparison of a number of different languages, the vocabularies of which he had either himself procured, or which, doubtlessly through Banks’s assistance, had been provided by earlier travellers. On the basis of this material Marsden inferred “that from Madagascar to eastward to the Marquesas, or nearly from the east coast of Africa to the west coast of America, there is *a manifest connexion in many words by which the inhabitants express their simple ideas*, and between some of the most distant, a striking affinity”.<sup>3</sup> Although Marsden did not draw any ethnological implications of this linguistic affinity here, he shortly afterwards made clear that this was certainly intended: in his “History of Sumatra” from 1783 it was thus stated that “this very extensive familiarity of language indicates a common origin of the inhabitants, but the circumstances and progress of their separation are wrapped in the darkest veil of obscurity”.<sup>4</sup>

Sir William Jones was in 1791 well aware of Marsden, who was already then a corresponding member of the Asiatick Society of Bengal,<sup>5</sup> and he was also familiar with his work. Yet there was not a common consensus between the two regarding what kind of inferences that could be drawn from the information and knowledge that they shared. Jones thus wrote that:

“If Mr. Marsden has proved (as he firmly believes, and as we from our knowledge of his accuracy may fairly assume) that clear vestiges of one ancient language are discernible in all the insular dialects of the southern seas, from Madagascar to the Philippines, and even to the remotest islands lately discovered, we may infer from the specimens in his account of Sumatra, *that the parent of them all was no other than the Sanscrit*.”<sup>6</sup>

Whereas Marsden concurred with Jones regarding “the traces of the Hindu language and literature extant amongst the Malays”, as his article published in Vol.IV of “*Asiatic Researches*”

<sup>1</sup> *Marsden 1838*, p.47; see also *Gascoigne*, p.165.

<sup>2</sup> The article was written 1780 and read before the society on Feb. 22 1781 (*Marsden 1782*). On the history of the “Society of Antiquaries of London and its journal “*Archæologia*” see esp. *Rowly-Conwy*; the society was created in 1707 as a more specialised alternative to Royal Society (*Díaz-Andreu*, p.54).

<sup>3</sup> *Marsden 1782*, p.135. In *Marsden 1798* this region had been extended to Easter Island instead of the Marquesas (p.227). As it will be analysed later in this chapter, this basic assumption spurred a plethora of theories, conjectures, and controversies regarding the origins, disseminations, and essences of the languages spoken by the societies inhabiting this vast zone; as such, Marsden’s rather disregarded ‘discovery’ resembles in many ways Sir William Jones’s slightly later formulation of the presence the huge Indo-European language family.

<sup>4</sup> *Marsden 1783*, p.35. This opinion was reiterated both in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. of this work, published in 1784, as well it was alluded to in the 1782 article and repeatedly restated in his later works.

<sup>5</sup> Marsden had been an original member of the Asiatick Society since its foundation in 1784 (*Marsden 1834*, p.1). In 1856 Crawford lauded Marsden with the following words: “He was a contemporary of Sir William Jones, of Colebrooke, and of his own relative, Sir Charles Wilkins [his father-in-law]; and while they were studying the philosophy of Continental Asia, he was doing the same thing for its islands.” (*Crawford 1856*, p.271, under the entry ‘Marsden’)

<sup>6</sup> *Jones 1824*, Vol.1 p.139. My italics.

was entitled,<sup>1</sup> he did not acquiesce to the idea that the established affinity between the two languages would be most aptly encapsulated by- and expressed within the metaphor of affiliation, as a connexion corresponding to that of parent and child. Although admitting that it was not easy to determine the nature and circumstances of the connexion between these languages,<sup>2</sup> Marsden, nonetheless, did not inscribe the connexion within a straight genealogical framework;<sup>3</sup> on the contrary, he emphasised that “it is not however to be understood, that the affinity between these languages is radical,<sup>4</sup> or that the names for the common objects of sense are borrowed from the Sanscrit”; rather, the connexion consisted in “Hindu words” in the Malay language being “*such as the progress of civilization must soon have rendered necessary*, being frequently expressive of the feelings of the mind, or denoting those ordinary modes of thought, which result from the social habits of mankind, or from the evils that tend to interrupt them”.<sup>5</sup> In Marsden’s opinion, Malay was “a branch or dialect of the widely extended language” that he had discerned more than 10 years earlier, and which had a “claim to the highest degree of antiquity, and to originality, as far as that term can be applied”.<sup>6</sup> Sanskrit had been introduced later, as both the harbinger- and as an integrated part of the *progress of civilization*.

### 1.1.1 Determining and Delineating the Indian Archipelago as an Analytical Space.

This counter-posing of Sir William Jones’s theories and Marsden’s linguistic tracings, as well as the inferences they drew from these, is suggestive of the pattern of the knowledge production on the past history and present ‘essences’ of many (especially, but not exclusively) non-European societies during a great part of the nineteenth century.<sup>7</sup> It touches upon a set of investigative fields<sup>8</sup> that were consistently addressed throughout this period, and which comprised, among others, the composition, boundaries, and essential affinities of this contested region between Asia and Oceania, and hence also of its proper denotation. This particularly involved the classification of the people inhabiting the region and a (re)construction of the historical trajectories that had led to their present spatial distribution and their achieved states of civilization. That is, a tracing of the origins, the early

<sup>1</sup> The article was originally written in 1793 (Marsden 1812a, p.xxiii). Hindu here referred especially to Sanskrit, and the Malays were commonly accepted as comprising one of the most advanced nations inhabiting the Indian islands. Jones’s 8<sup>th</sup> Discourse had been published in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Vol. of “Asiatick Researches” in 1792 (Kejariwal, p.69 states 1793)

<sup>2</sup> Marsden 1798, p.229.

<sup>3</sup> This linguistic-ethnological approach has been thoroughly analysed by Trautmann (see Trautmann 1997/2004, ch.1).

<sup>4</sup> As it will be examined in Part III, this notion of *radical words* played a key role in the linguistic analyses and hence also in the ethnological and historical inferences drawn from these. The definition, identification, and implications of these *radical words* constituted the nodal point in many of the debates on these matters.

<sup>5</sup> Marsden 1798, p.227. My italics.

<sup>6</sup> Marsden 1798, p.227.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Díaz-Andreu, pp.349-354.

<sup>8</sup> For an informed discussion of the applicability of the notion of *field* in 19<sup>th</sup> century British intellectual history, see the “Introduction” in Beer (pp.1-9).

migrations and dispersions of the various peoples, nations, and races in the region, as well as a categorization of the stages of civilization existent amongst these societies.

The writings that followed from these studies were primarily inscribed within broader discursive frameworks delineated by the disciplines of *history* (chronological narrative), *conjectural history* (stadial analysis of civilizations), and *ethnology* (genealogical diffusion and racial distribution); they made extensive use of methodological approaches, argumentative modalities, and kinds of evidence associated with the practices of philology, antiquarianism, linguistics, political economy, racial theories, etc.. Amongst these, especially the approach embedded in comparative linguistics stood out as the methodological *primus inter pares*, and the study of language soon became the most important subject area. However, as already sketched, there was even *within* the linguistic studies a discrepancy in the approaches to- and inferences drawn from the linguistic evidence; these depended on the theories and methodologies that were deemed authoritative as well as the referential framework within which they were situated. Furthermore, the ascribed primacy of comparative linguistics – as constituting the foremost medium through which the history and ‘essence’ of these societies could be reached – came under increasing pressure from the *outside* in the shape of the methodological ascendancy of the biological study of race as providing another, perhaps more, reliable access to these aspects.

In the following I will map the epistemological spaces, analyze the theories and methodologies, as well as trace the dynamics of the British ideas on Southeast Asia as a geographical space. My attention will be on how the empowering process of place-naming symbolically transformed this epistemologically open space into a particular place; that is, a *place* in the meaning of “a space with history”.<sup>1</sup> Geographical names are never neutral, and they signify more than just a denomination of an empty area: a term like the *Indian Archipelago* thus contributed essentially to the ways in which the peoples, civilizations, and cultures inhabiting this region were conceptualised by being authoritatively inscribed into their assumed adequate and authentic contexts.

My examination spans from the Biblical-genealogical framework of the Moderate Enlightenment, as epitomized in Sir William Jones’s writings but which also affected William Marsden’s approaches,<sup>2</sup> and down to A.R. Wallace’s writings and their emphasis on biology much more than on language.

This investigation will be centred on Crawford’s involvement in the British approaches to Southeast Asia as an autonomous geographical space tugged in between Asia and the insular world

---

<sup>1</sup> Withers 2009, p.647.

<sup>2</sup> Throughout all of his writings on linguistic matters Marsden seemed to have done his best to evade touching upon the question of the ultimate origins of the languages in the region he described and of the people who spoke these languages.

of the South Seas, and at the same time as a conceptually contested boundary zone between these two different wor(l)ds. Then, in chapter 2, it will be examined how this ‘space turned into a contested place’ was attributed with different, competing histories that added new dimensions of meaning to it, before I, in the third chapter, analyse how the travelling gaze was conditioned by-, and also conditioned, the ideas on the historical, anthropological, and political essences that were tacitly ingrained in these geographical names. This latter study concentrates on the ways in which Crawford employed the trope of Oriental despotism in the various genres in which he wrote extensively on the Indian Archipelago; the focus will be on his travelogues and on how the observations recorded here were materialized somewhere in between the predominant British visions and the acute Southeast Asian realities. In this context the term *vision* possesses double, or perhaps even, triple meanings: vision in the sense that the British viewed Southeast Asia through their own specific conceptual lenses and hence from an always posited, interest charged, and biased angle that only allowed an already prefigured and selected fragment of the totality to be perceived; it pointed to the privileging of vision over other means of ascertaining the world; and finally the term also implied a dimension of being *visionary* – that is, being in possession of both the foresight and the ideological ideas that provided a direct link between this knowledge production and the processes of expansion, consolidation, and administration that was involved in these colonial enterprises.

## **1.2 Locational Technologies: Defining and Describing Spaces.**

As an antidote to the narrow focus on the instrumentalist aspect of the colonial knowledge production, T.R. Trautmann has often stressed the need to include *longue durée* trends in the study of the colonial knowledge produced by the scholar-administrators and travelling savants in India during the latter part of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup>.<sup>1</sup> He has thus recently argued that “it is my feeling that colonial knowledge cannot be fully explained by focussing narrowly on the colonial situation, and that a lens of wider angle is needed to carry the analysis forward”; and this implies that to “account adequately for colonial knowledge we need to look at the colonial nexus, but we need also to examine what knowledges the parties to the colonial relation brought with them”.<sup>2</sup> It is in this context he introduced the notion of *locational technologies*.

Any attempt to analytically approach and understand a foreign region and its societies implies some sort of prefiguring framework; this delineates the basic contours of space into which the societies can be inscribed, and thence ascribed both a geographical position and attributed with a

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Trautmann 1995, pp.174-178, Trautmann 1997/2004, pp.52-57, Trautmann 2009 (article org. Publ. 1999), p.108

<sup>2</sup> Trautmann 2009a, p.157; this is from the article entitled “Finding India’s Place: Locational Projects of the *Longue Durée*”, org. published in this volume. In the following I concentrate exclusively of the ‘European part’ in this relation.



meaningful relation to the already known world. This act of positioning<sup>1</sup> invariably involves some mode of locational technology that serves to “define representational spaces and represent entities as locations within those spaces.”<sup>2</sup> The practices entailed in these locational technologies were not invented as much as invoked in the colonial situation: any “action involving non-European peoples was inevitably influenced by preconceptions and supposed knowledge”.<sup>3</sup>

In finding India’s proper place through the mapping of its space(s), Trautmann emphasised three locational technologies.<sup>4</sup> The mapping of physical space according to the traditional longitude and latitude divided grid originally devised by Ptolemy. The chronological ordering of time along the lines first laid out by Eusebius, and which intended the “integration of [all] national histories into the grid of world chronology, whereby the horizontal rows gave the synchronic events in the known world for any given year” – this methodology implied that all other chronologies were straightened out into a linear form and then embedded firmly with the Biblical-Roman temporality.<sup>5</sup> Lastly, Trautmann mentioned the Mosaic ethnology which sought to locate all nations of the world within a structure based on the trope of the segmentary Tree of Nations, where the various peoples of the world were linked in terms of genealogical descent, and where the inhabiting of the world was perceived as a process of diffusion emanating from either the descendants of Noah, or from the dispersions of people that followed after the collapse of the Tower of Babel.<sup>6</sup>

The Ptolemaic locational technology necessitated the charting and mapping of the space that it sought to circumscribe. It has by now for long been acknowledged that “maps are not transparent and innocent representations of geographical reality and space. Instead they are constructive, not mimetic, and are produced through the work of power/knowledge rather than benignly ‘mirroring’ a fixed given reality”.<sup>7</sup> Thus it has been argued that our modern idea of *India* arose as a direct result of the British imperial enterprise there between c.1760-c.1850.<sup>8</sup> Even more important in this

---

<sup>1</sup> A process which involves the use of analogical inferences in order to be able to relate hitherto unknown and undescribed entities or systems to already structured frameworks by either comparing, contrasting, or inscribing the formers (in)to the latter. (See esp. *Livingstone & Harrison 1981*, and subsidiary *Livingstone & Harrison 1982*)

<sup>2</sup> *Trautmann 2006*, p.3.

<sup>3</sup> *Marshall & Williams*, p.3.

<sup>4</sup> Where nothing else is mentioned the following is based on “Finding India’s Place: Locational Projects of the Longue Durée”, in *Trautmann 2009a*, pp.155-188, or subsidiary on *Trautmann 2006*, pp.2-21.

<sup>5</sup> For a further discussion of the attempts to straighten out- and making fit the Indian notions of time within the European concept of time see Trautmann’s article “Indian Time, European Time”, printed in *Hughes & Trautmann*, pp.167-197 & in *Trautmann 2009a*, pp.25-52.

<sup>6</sup> On this topic, see *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.37-52, *Stocking 1987*, pp.41-45, *Eco 1995*, ch.5; for a longer analysis of a historiographical approach firmly embedded in this locational project, see *Rowly-Conwy*, pp.22-32.

<sup>7</sup> *Ramaswamy*, p.99.

<sup>8</sup> This is Edney’s main argument in *Edney*, and it has been restated in *Keay 2000* (see esp. pp.82-83). Edney (p.338) summarizes the whole (discursive) process of mapping as thus: “Maps are one of many means whereby cultures and societies, or segments hereof, redefine and reproduce themselves. Maps are representations of knowledge; as representations, they are constructed according to culturally defined semiotic codes; the knowledge is constructed using various intellectual and instrumental technologies; the knowledge and its representations are both constructed by individuals who work for and within various social institutions, according to cultural expectations. That is, the British

context, however, is the manner in which such spatial demarcations and linkages prefigured the referential and comparative frameworks of the societies and peoples that inhabited these spaces. B.S. Cohn has described how the classification of the peoples of India underwent a series of dramatic changes between c.1500-c.1800. First they were assessed within a Christian→↔Non-Christian dichotomy where the latter could be perceived as either infidels or as proto-Christians;<sup>1</sup> the applied nomenclature in this process drew extensively upon the one already in use when describing the Moors of the Mediterranean,<sup>2</sup> and as such India was from the onset firmly incorporated within the sphere of orientalism.<sup>3</sup> Later, this interpretive modality gave way to another one of perceiving the essence of India in terms of the ‘bizarre’ and utterly exotic,<sup>4</sup> only to be substituted by a new, somewhat retrovert tendency towards *domesticating India* by using a well known terminology that drew more attention to the (assumed universal) similarities between India and Europe than to the incommensurable discrepancies ingrained in the exotic; hence this modality inscribed India into a set of familiar analytical categories. This practice was founded upon the “new interpretive strategies based on the Scottish Enlightenment’s progressive-stage theory of the movement from rudeness to civilization, which provided indices to classify the varied peoples of India”.<sup>5</sup>

This latter approach suggested a new, fourth locational strategy, viz. the progressionist-stage theory of civilization; this was articulated within the trope of the stadial ladder. Although Trautmann had dealt exhaustively with this trope before,<sup>6</sup> he here only associated it with the incipient ‘Indophobia’ of C. Grant, James Mill, and the likes (including Crawford!). After having counter-posed it to “the older locational projects”,<sup>7</sup> Trautmann argued that the “Scale of Civilization, then, this fourth locational project, becomes the theoretical base for a liberal theory of

---

did not mis-represent India when they made their maps of the subcontinent, nor did they re-present India, as they claimed. Instead, they created a geographical conception that served them well, within the confines of their imperial system. It is only when we consider the mapping of India from outside of that system that the British self-delusions and the mythic character of their geographical archive becomes evident”. In contrast to this argument Trautmann would stress that the instrumentalist aspect (“a geographical conception that served them well”) should not be overemphasised; instead, he, as already mentioned, pleaded for the need to “adopt a wider, deeper historical perspective” (Trautmann 2009a, p.181) in order to also appreciate the epistemic limitations which had always already been framing the conceptual space in which such ideas and practices could be enacted.

<sup>1</sup> Cohn 1998, pp.1-10. A more general analysis of this can be found in McGrane, esp. pp.8-20.

<sup>2</sup> Cohn 1998, p.4. In some fields this approach proved very resistant, and thus, for instance, part of the ‘piratical’ population inhabiting Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago were even in 19<sup>th</sup> century Spanish discourses consistently referred to as ‘moros’ (i.e. as ‘moors’), and the “Moro wars” against them was framed as a continued fight between Christians and Muslims. (See Barrantes and Bernaldez; for a modern assessment, see Warren 1981/2007, pp.xx-xxi)

<sup>3</sup> Arnold 2005, p.121, Irwin 2006, pp.159-163, and Marshall & Williams.

<sup>4</sup> Cohn 1998, pp.10-15; Cohn dated the initialization of this mode to the publication of Linschoten’s “Itinerary” in 1595, and stated that it was “to last into the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>5</sup> Cohn 1998, pp.16-17.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Trautmann 1997/2004 and Trautmann 1992.

<sup>7</sup> The locational project articulated through the stadial model could also trace its origins back to antiquity (see e.g. Høiris 2001a, pp.132-156); however, in this context it could be considered ‘new’ in the sense that it was only applied upon the Indian setting from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

empire, one which thrashes India's past accomplishments in order to justify a policy of aggressive Europeanization".<sup>1</sup> Whatever the merits of this locational project may have been in India,<sup>2</sup> I will here argue that, in the context of Southeast Asia, it had a considerable impact. Not at least because the chronological approach, as will be discussed later, was largely dismissed due to what was perceived as a lack of (credible) written source-material on/from the region. This flawed source-material thus had to be substituted by other sources, and in the absence of a reliable fixed and comparable chronology, the event-based narration seemed excluded; thence it had to be replaced by other modes of dynamic explanation, such as the diffusionist and segmentary genealogical model or the progressionist structure of stadial civilization.

### **1.3 Placing a Name, Naming the Place: Conceptualizing through Denomination.**

The discovery and subsequent mapping and charting of the region now known as Southeast Asia has a protracted and dense history; however, it is not the place to dwell too much upon this here.<sup>3</sup> Instead I will in the following concentrate on the changes in the terms used to denominate this region by various British scholar-administrators, travellers, colonial residents, linguists, and ethnologists in the era between Marsden and Wallace. All of these protagonists thus pertained to at least one, and in many cases to both, of the groups participating in what B. Douglas recently has called "the asymmetric interplay of two overlapping modes of knowing, one global but highly ethnocentric and deductive; the other regional and empirical."<sup>4</sup> Both of these relied and fed upon each other in an entwined and mutually dependent "mismatch of theory and praxis" in "the junction of shifting metropolitan discourses and ambiguous regional praxis";<sup>5</sup> within these processes all the involved knowledge producers strove to cram the "highly varied mix of human physical features, - lifestyles and behaviours into neat racial [and civilizational] slots."<sup>6</sup>

Apart from indicating the intended spatial connexions, these geographical denominations also proved to be suggestive of the ethnological and civilizational ties that the societies and peoples in this region were assumed to share with other peoples outside of it. Rather than merely being embedded in physical geography,<sup>7</sup> the names bestowed upon this region appeared to rely more on the perceptions of human geography, and hence they involved notions of race and history as well as

---

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann 2009a, p.188.

<sup>2</sup> This has been discussed thoroughly in the initial chapter on historiography, especially in terms of the impact of Scottish theories upon Indian Governance.

<sup>3</sup> On some of these aspects in the 19th century, see Goodman and Tagliacozzo 2004.

<sup>4</sup> Douglas 2010, p.205.

<sup>5</sup> Douglas 2010, p.210.

<sup>6</sup> Douglas 2010, p.207.

<sup>7</sup> On the burgeoning discipline of geography and its criteria for framing regions, see e.g. Douglas & Ballard, "Introduction"; Staum, ch.4; Stafford (esp. pp.203-223); Driver, pp.1-48.

of civilization; this process invariably invoked the ubiquitous notion of language as being the provider of the most transparent access to these queries.

B. Douglas has in a kindred context – concerning the naming and conceptual coining of the Pacific and Australian areas between the notions of *Terra Australis* and *Oceania* – argued that the latter was “inherently racialized”, and it served as “a synecdoche for the fertile marriage of geography and raciology”.<sup>1</sup> With the addition of the notion of *civilization* as constituting an equally influential concept, I endeavour to do something similar in a Southeast Asian setting, albeit my temporal scope is slimmer and the focus is primarily limited to British discourses. Thus what I aim at here is, in the words of B. Douglas, “to disentangle the semantic history of words [used to denominate this region] and their vernacular uses, and to expose the unthinking anachronism which reifies historically contingent arrangements or concepts as inevitable and eternal.”<sup>2</sup>

This task seem all the more relevant in the context of the geographical area of Southeast Asia which, throughout the European history of geography, has proven particularly resistant to any consensus on both the coining an apt name as well the drawing of fixed boundaries and the establishment of an essence defining this ethnically extremely heterogeneous zone.<sup>3</sup> This topic has recently been analyzed by e.g. D.K. Emmerson, V. King, B. Andaya, and most recently A. Webster who, applying a network approach, stressed that by the 19<sup>th</sup> C. this “led to the emergence among Straits British merchants and administrators of a sense of Southeast Asia as a discrete region.”<sup>4</sup> It is the more conceptual aspects of this ideologically charged, socio-semantic process that I here will endeavour to delineate

Claiming “that names are rooted neither in reality nor custom, but express instead the power of the namer over the thing named”,<sup>5</sup> D.K. Emmerson emphasised that in the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, “as western imperialism matured and its hold [on Southesast Asia] deepened, as each dependency became more thoroughly and exclusively orientated towards its respective metropole in Europe, it became harder for Europeans, to say nothing of people in what is now Southeast Asia, to think of the region as a whole”.<sup>6</sup> This fragmenting process must thus have obliterated earlier, nascent steps towards assessing this region as one single and united entity, and it was not until well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century that a wide consensus on perceiving it in its entirety resurged.<sup>7</sup> Prior to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Douglas 2010, p.202.

<sup>2</sup> Douglas 2010, p.210.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. the Introduction in Andaya, pp.1-17.

<sup>4</sup> See Emmerson, Andaya, King, and Webster 2010, p.903.

<sup>5</sup> Emmerson p.4.

<sup>6</sup> Emmerson, p.5.

<sup>7</sup> Emmerson, pp.5-7; see also Reid 2003, pp.1-3. Recently, the very concept of Southeast Asia as forming an adequate analytical unit has recently been contested from especially a nationalistic point of view as forming yet another conceptual vestige of the colonial heritage (see e.g. Tarling 1999, p.405 & p.415, and more generally Tarling 2001, pp.524-527). For a longue durée analysis of some of the aspects involved herein, see Lieberman 1993.

segmentation of the region during the era of high imperialism, and which in the end had resulted in the carving out of the presently existing nation-states, there had, however, been many attempts to conceptualize this region as one coherent unity, and then to denominate it appropriately.

This conceptual process seems to have been accelerated especially during the years c.1780-c.1830: drawing upon C.A. Bayly's global analysis, L. Blussé has argued that this period saw a series of crucial changes in both the internal setup of the region and in its position in the global networks within which it became increasingly enmeshed.<sup>1</sup> If not causing the intensified interest in the conceptual framing of the region amongst the European nations per se, then these processes at least provided the possibility, and one may add even the *plausibility*, for some of the more scholarly inclined individuals amongst the travellers, seamen, or administrators to dwell more upon these vexed questions. Two of the first to do this in a systemised manner were Sir William Jones and William Marsden.

### **1.3.1 W. Marsden between the Malay Archipelago and Hither Polynesia.**

The terms referring to the subsuming of this region into the grander and more amorphous one of India had, as earlier mentioned, a long and cogent history. Terms such as East Indies, Further India, India ultra gangem, and their equivalents in other European languages were as rife as they were suggestive. However, when Marsden first framed his oppositional notion of “the striking affinity” in the languages (in *radical words* to be more exact) spoken in the area between Madagascar and the Marquesas, he did not accompany this with any term coined to designate this vast zone; nor did any such appear in the two first editions of “History of Sumatra”,<sup>2</sup> except from the very vague allusions to “all the islands of the eastern sea”.<sup>3</sup> In the article published in Vol.IV of Asiatick Researches, the notion of this vast, linguistically connected, zone was reiterated, and, although it still had not been assigned any name, it was here defined as being composed of two linguistically linked, but geographically separated, zones, viz. 1) the ‘Malay-Archipelago’, being “understood to comprehend the Sunda, Philippine, and Mólucca islands”, having in common that “in the maritime parts of which, the Malayan is used as a lingua franca”, and 2) the ‘South-sea’ which was not further defined; to these Madagascar should be added.<sup>4</sup> Yet, Marsden had by 1812 come up with a nomenclature that both maintained these two major subregions and also tied them together. The first was circumscribed by the extension of the Malay language and thus composed of “the southern part

---

<sup>1</sup> Blussé 2005, esp. pp.11-15. See also the relevant parts of Bayly 1989.

<sup>2</sup> Neither were there any such references in the 3rd, otherwise much revised, edition from 1811; in fact, in this context it contained a verbatim reproduction of the text in the first editions. The same is the case in both the French translation from 1788 (*Marsden 1788*, Vol.I, pp.305-306) and in the German translation from 1785 (*Marsden 1785b*, p.213).

<sup>3</sup> E.g. p.160 in *Marsden 1784*, and p.200 in *Marsden 1811*.

<sup>4</sup> *Marsden 1798*, p.227. Malayan was considered as (later together with Javanese) the most polished and advanced of the languages belonging to this “widely extended language” – as it will be analysed in Part III.

of the peninsula beyond the Ganges, now bearing the name the Malayan peninsula” and the islands “forming collectively the Malayan archipelago. This great insular region may also not inaptly receive the appellation of the *Hither* Polynesia, as distinguished from the *Further* Polynesia or vast expanse of South-sea islands, between which New Guinea may be considered as the common boundary”.<sup>1</sup> The entire region was tied together by the assumption of sharing what was assumed to be an original, or proto-, language which “may conveniently be termed the Polynesian”;<sup>2</sup> at times Marsden used the term ‘East insular’, or ‘East-Insular’, almost synonymously with Polynesian, but these latter terms remained vaguely defined.<sup>3</sup> The boundary separating the two parts geographically was composed by New Guinea and its adjacent islands. The interesting point here is that this appeared to have been as much racially (in a strict biological sense) as linguistically determined: without venturing further into the complexities of the then unknown realms of New Guinean ethnology and linguistics (see Part I), Marsden merely stated that the “people termed Papua”<sup>4</sup>, like the Samang and the Negritos belong to “a race totally distinct from the yellow complexioned, long haired natives of whom we are speaking”, and, apart from presenting a “subject as curious as it is obscure”, these people were not in any way deemed “immediately connected with the Malays or their language”,<sup>5</sup> and hence they fell out of the scope of Marsden’s discourse.<sup>6</sup>

The term Polynesia did not originate by Marsden’s pen. It was, as he himself professed, appropriated from the Scottish EIC civil servant, hydrographer, and later compiler of travel accounts Alexander Dalrymple<sup>7</sup> who in turn had borrowed it from the French Enlightenment thinker Charles de Brosses. De Brosses, a landlocked sofa savant who had also written an influential treatise on the ‘mechanical formation of languages’<sup>8</sup> (1765), had 9 years before published a compilation of travels to the South seas entitled “*Historie des navigations aux terres australes*”; here he has introduced the term ‘Polynesia’ to denote one of the inhabited parts of the Pacific, and as opposed to ‘Australasia’.<sup>9</sup> The distinction between these two parts appeared primarily to have been

---

<sup>1</sup> *Marsden 1812a*, p.i; Marsden’s italics.

<sup>2</sup> *Marsden 1812a*, xviii.

<sup>3</sup> Thus it appeared sometimes to refer to whole Polynesian zone (*Marsden 1812a*, pp.vi, xxii, & 115 [although here termed as “the great East-Insular”]), whereas it also was applied as synonymous with only Hither Polynesia (p.xviii).

<sup>4</sup> On the vicissitudes in the use, and attributed etymology, of this term, see *Gelpke* (p.320 on Marsden and Crawford)

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1812a*, p.xxii.

<sup>6</sup> Marsden, due to his purely linguistic agenda, did not address the then moot question of how two so different races could share the same environment and co-inhabit the same geographical zone; see Part I, ch.3.

<sup>7</sup> The authoritative text on Dalrymple is Fry’s biography; Dalrymple was one of the first to advocate for a reintensification of EIC’s involvement in Southeast Asia, and, before becoming instrumental in the (albeit failed) founding of a factory of Balambangan, he participated in voyages of discovery in the zone, (*Fry*, ch.4, see also *Warren 1981/2007*, pp.17-37, and *Rutter*, pp.56-75); later, as EIC’s official hydrographer, he was an avid compiler and prolific publisher of travel accounts.

<sup>8</sup> On Brosses’s writings on language philosophy, their reception, and impact, see *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, esp. pp.34-36, *Eco1995*, pp.92-93, *Hudson 1994*, p.85.

<sup>9</sup> On Brosses and the impact of his writings on the Pacific, see: *Ryan* (whole text), *Tcherkézoff* (whole text), *Douglas 2005* (whole text), *Mawyer* (p.367, on Marsden’s use of him), *Carhart* (esp. pp.68-69), *Douglas & Ballard* (pp.6-7 &

drawn upon racial criteria: Brossets seemed to have been the first to scholarly institutionalise the divide between these two races, or varieties,<sup>1</sup> the one dark and with frizzled hair and the other light-skinned, co-existing in the Pacific, and then to explain their present distribution in terms of a narrative of gradual dispersion of the allegedly more primitive, dark skinned by the lighter skinned and more civilised people.<sup>2</sup> In contrast to this focus on the visible, and thus easily taxonomical, traits Marsden turned his analytical lens towards the perceived inner, organicist ties, embodied in the linguistic affinity and epitomized in the genealogical framework of common origin and subsequent diffusion.<sup>3</sup> This implied, although Marsden always was wary about expressing any explicit surmises regarding the ultimate origins and the earliest diffusions, that the insular realms of Polynesia was extended westwards to Madagascar, and also comprised what otherwise was known as the Malay Archipelago or the East Indies.

Even though Marsden maintained the appellations of *Hither* and *Further Polynesia* in his last publication on this topic from 1834,<sup>4</sup> this nomenclature did not gain any general footing.<sup>5</sup> Even Marsden himself seemed by the 1820s in practice to have given way to a definition of Polynesia advocated especially by the French, and where this term was strictly constricted to the Pacific.<sup>6</sup>

---

102-106), *Marshall & Williams* (pp.260-263), *Liebersohn* (pp.32-33). Apart from the professed debt to de Brossets and Dalrymple Marsden might, however, have had a third, and more recent source of inspiration. The Scottish polygenist J. Pinkerton, who was most famous for his theories on the Scythians, Goths, and Celts (see *Kidd*, pp.110-112 and *Rowly-Conwy*, pp.141-142), had also published a “Modern Geography: A Description of the Empires, Kingdoms, States, and Colonies”, which went through many editions – the last one before Marsden’s publication was in 1811. In the 1804 edition of this text Pinkerton distinguished between “the Asiatic Isles (or Oriental Archipelago), Australasia, and Polynesia” along lines which appear to correspond to the lines drawn by Marsden in his demarcations between Hither Polynesia, New Guinea, and Further Polynesia, if New Holland was added to New Guinea as together composing Australasia. Contrary to Marsden, though, Pinkerton stressed that “if however Australasia and Polynesia be not admitted as grand divisions, they must fall under the Asiatic Islands” (Vol.II, p.334); that is, ultimately, it would be Asia rather than the Pacific that would lend its name to the region. (*Pinkerton 1804*, Vol.II, pp.330-393). For more on the contemporary reception of Pinkerton’s work and theories, see *Stock*, pp.19-25, and *Bredal*, pp.314-317.

<sup>1</sup> See *Tcherkézoff*, *Douglas 2005*, *Douglas 2006*, and *Douglas & Ballard*, ch.2-3).

<sup>2</sup> *Marsden 1834*, pp.3-4 referred briefly to the so-called *displacement narrative*; See *Douglas & Ballard*, ch.2.

<sup>3</sup> This appears to fit into Foucault’s scheme, where the visually grounded, classificatory taxonomy in late 18th century gave way to a new episteme founded upon inner organisation and -hierarchies; meaning that the act of naming was no longer merely a question of inventing the most apt classificatory structure, but instead it became a matter of discovering the inner, essential structures, and then denominate these accordingly. (See esp. Ch.8 in Foucault’s *The order of Things*). However, it has to be stressed that neither Marsden’s approach nor the use of language as a source to history were new, but on the contrary depended upon a long tradition, as it has been delineated by, amongst others, Aarsleff, Eco, Olender, and Trautmann. If there was anything revolutionary about Marsden’s ideas, it lay rather in his choice of field, the analytical scope, and particularly in the methodological rigour with which he embarked upon this project.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. *Marsden 1834*, pp.6, 7, 49, 55, 74 & 119.

<sup>5</sup> An exception to this pattern is the use of the term in J.D. Lang’s “View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation” from 1834 where the ‘Polynesian nation’ was claimed to have occupied the whole region thus denominated by Marsden, and even to have formed settlements on the American continent.

<sup>6</sup> Thus, in the published inventory of Marsden’s library on linguistic topics “Biblioteca Marsdeniana”, in the section on “Catalogue of Manuscripts” one of the heads was “Polynesian of [or?] South-Sea Islands” (*Marsden 1827*, p.306), and it was explicitly distinguished from other parts of the region which Marsden had earlier dubbed ‘Polynesia’, such as the Javanese, Malayan, Philippine and Molucca Islands, etc.. In the similar “Catalogue” published in 1796 (*Marsden 1796*) the term Polynesia, or any of its derivatives, did not appear anywhere: In the section on printed works the books dealing with languages of this vast, yet unbaptised, zone was split of in two parts, “Malayan, Javan, Philippine, Madagascar” (pp.118-120) and “Otaïtean or South-Sea” (p.122) without any apparent linkages between the two. In *Marsden 1827* all

Marsden had been a pioneer in demonstrating the presence of Sanskrit words in especially, but not exclusively, the Malay language; yet in terms of defining the geographical space where these languages were spoken he nonetheless did his utmost to dissociate it from the sphere of Asia. Not that he denied the profound historical influence from the Asian mainland upon the region; however, due to its later date this influence, this was considered contingent rather than essential to the region. Being inhabited by another branch of people, speaking a radically different language, it was geographically a neighbour to-, rather than a part of, Asia. In contrast to this, Sir Stamford Raffles saw the Asian influence as more essential to the region, and he traced its ‘finest hour’ to the time when the ancient Indians stretched their influence to this region, and which especially on Java had left lasting vestiges in language, poetry, and not at least in the shape of picturesque ruins of Hindu and Buddhist temples, as well as it was still vibrant on Bali. Referring to Marsden’s “Grammar”, Raffles accepted Marsden’s idea of how “one original language seems, in a very remote period, to have pervaded the whole archipelago”, yet the crucial point to Raffles was that “in proportion that we find any of these tribes more highly advanced in the arts of civilized life than others, in nearly the same proportion do we find the language enriched by a corresponding accession of Sanscrit terms, *directing us at once to the source whence civilization flowed towards these regions.*”<sup>1</sup>

### 1.3.2 The Malays and the Dual Character of Leyden’s Indo-Chinese Nations.

If it had not been for his premature demise, due to a malignant fever contracted at Batavia shortly after the British invasion of Java in 1811, the Scottish EIC civil servant John Leyden (1775-1812)<sup>2</sup> might actually have succeeded in his quest to become Sir William Jones’s scholarly successor. As part of this ‘programme’<sup>3</sup> he had published an article in the 10<sup>th</sup> Vol. of Asiatick Researches with the title “On the Languages and of the Indo-Chinese Nations”. As well the title as the very structure of this article revealed that Leyden perceived the region, which Marsden shortly

---

of these had been subsumed under one heading – “Malayan, East-Insular, Madagascar, New Holland” (pp.231-240). When inferring from the inventory of someone’s library to the discursive influences upon this individual there are obviously various aspects that need to be taken into account; on some such considerations in the case of the travel literature in Locke’s library and his use of this, see Paxman 1995, p.461.

<sup>1</sup> Raffles 1817, Vol.I, p.369; my italics. Raffles had in 1815, in a paper read before the resurrected Batavian Society, stated that: “If we contemplate the various nations and tribes which inhabit the *Southern Peninsula of India*, and the innumerable islands composing that portion of the Globe comprehended within *Polynesia* and *Austral Asia*, our attention is arrested by the *striking uniformity in habits and language* which prevails throughout, inducing the inference *either of common origin or of early and very general intercourse.*” (Raffles 1816, p.70); my italics. Pay attention to how Raffles also tentatively included the “Southern Peninsula of India” in this region!

<sup>2</sup> In his biography of Leyden, Crawford claimed that he was the first to frame the designation of ‘Indo-Chinese nations’; in assessing his scholarly qualifications Crawford stated that: “Leyden’s oriental erudition, more particularly as relating to Malay literature, was more multifarious and surprising than accurate, as might reasonably be expected from the number and rapidity of his acquisitions”. (Crawford 1856, p.216) In fact, at the time of the publication of this article, Leyden’s empirical knowledge of this zone was restricted to a short furlough at Penang during Raffles’s stay there (Wurtzburg, pp.35-39; his stay stretched from Oct.22 1805 to early Jan. 1806).

<sup>3</sup> For an analysis of Leyden’s approaches to oriental languages and society, and to how these composed a part of his career strategy, see Trautmann 2006, pp.86-96, which is based on an extensive reading of his unpublished manuscripts.



after was to denominate ‘Hither Polynesia’, as an integrated part of Asia. Leyden thus asserted the fundamental unity of the islands and the mainland region of Asia between India and China, despite acknowledging a profound structural discrepancy between the polysyllabic character of “the more original languages of the *eastern isles*” (such as particularly “the Malayu”)<sup>1</sup> on the one hand, and the strictly monosyllabic languages existent on the mainland part of region on the other.<sup>2</sup> Leyden may well have appropriated this philologically founded distinction from J.C. Adelung who, in the first volume of his “Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde”, from 1806 had operated with the same distinction between mono- and polysyllabic languages. Adelung had classified Malayan as a sort of intermediary between these two categories; he claimed that it may have originated as a monosyllabic language but later *evolved* into a polysyllabic one, and now it belonged among these.<sup>3</sup>

This recognition of an essential unity was accompanied by a refutation of Marsden’s theory on the existence of a Polynesian language family, as well as of his hypothesis regarding its dissemination across the vast oceanic zone.<sup>4</sup> This, again, implied both a firm reinscription of this insular region into the Asian sphere and a disentanglement of it from the Pacific zone; accordingly, as a result of this spatial demarcation, his linguistic analysis did not go beyond the Philippine islands.<sup>5</sup> Instead, Leyden claimed to posit his own interpretation somewhere in between the ones advocated by Sir William Jones and Marsden;<sup>6</sup> the notion of India was more instrumental in defining this region than Marsden seems to have claimed, but not as essential as Jones thought. Or, in other words, Leyden ended up with carving out a region that, in spatial extension, closely resembled our modern notion of Southeast Asia. Clear in his spatial demarcations of the region, it nonetheless remained vaguer what actually bounded it together: evidently, it was neither the genealogical dissemination of language nor shared fundamental linguistic structures, although he explicitly had ascribed an analytical prerogative to these.<sup>7</sup> Rather, it appeared to have been an assumed common history that had left its lasting imprint in the shape of shared religion, manners,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Leyden 1811*, p.161.

<sup>2</sup> All of these were deemed to be monosyllabic, except from the Malay spoken on the Malay peninsula, Pali which was introduced from India as the ‘sacred language’ of Buddhism and which was disseminated along with the spread of this religion, and the Champa language; Crawford actually seems to have been the first to identify Cham as a polysyllabic language, as it has been noticed by G. Thurgood. (*Thurgood*, pp.30-31)

<sup>3</sup> *Adelung & Vater*, vol.I, p.100. The analysis of the Malayan language was thus placed as the first language in the part dedicated to the polysyllabic languages, Leyden did not refer to Adelung’s philological studies in this article, but he had done so in some of his earlier works.

<sup>4</sup> *Leyden 1811*, p.166-168. In his rejection of Marsden’s ideas, Leyden here referred the articles printed in *Archæologia* vol.VI and in Vol.IV of *Asiatick Researches*. He does not seem to have been aware of any manuscript edition or the like of Marsden’s *Grammar and Vocabulary* that was published in 1812. In this text Marsden took much pain in vindicating his own stance and refuting Leyden’s without, however, discrediting the then late Leyden too severely.

<sup>5</sup> The last of the polysyllabic, insular languages to be analysed in this article was the Tagala of the Philippines, under the head of which the little known languages of Borneo and of the “Papuas” were included (*Leyden 1811*, pp.207-221).

<sup>6</sup> On examples of Leyden’s counter-posing of his own interpretation vis-à-vis Marsden’s, see e.g. pp.168, 170, & 173.

<sup>7</sup> The instances of this are abundant, see e.g. *Leyden 1811*, p.162 & p.221.

and certain elements regarding the ‘state of society’,<sup>1</sup> but even here he acknowledged glaring discrepancies between the Buddhist mainland and the mainly Muslim and pagan insular region.<sup>2</sup>

### 1.3.3 Crawford’s Route to the Indian Archipelago.

In his first published writings on this region Crawford had simply dubbed it the Indian Islands,<sup>3</sup> and these writings did not reveal any profound reflections upon the most apt criteria for a delineation of this area. Most remarkable in this context was perhaps the silence in the review of Marsden’s Grammar and Dictionary on Marsden’s ideas on the existence of a great Polynesian zone; instead it dealt solely with the just as contended question of the tracing of the location where the Malay *nation* could have originated, and the place from which they later disseminated and spread their influence. The frequent references to Leyden’s long article in Asiatick Researches suggested that Crawford’s approach at this point was guided by the principles that his fellow countryman had sketched.<sup>4</sup> However, by the time he published his magnum opus, “History of the Indian Archipelago” (HIA), in 1820 Crawford had, as the title indicates, coined a new term that framed the analytical approach to the region. Just like Marsden had not invented the term Polynesia, the name the Indian Archipelago was not solely a product of Crawford’s mind; already used by, for instance, Marsden, J. Pinkerton, C. Assay, Raffles, and James Mill,<sup>5</sup> it appears to have been one of the several terms referring roughly to this region which were in use. However, it was with the publication of HIA that *the Indian Archipelago* became the standard term used to designate this region within British colonial- and scholarly discourses during the next 40-50 years, as it has convincingly been argued by J. Bastin and B. Harrison in the 1960s.<sup>6</sup> In terms of geographical extension it corresponded rather well to the insular part of Leyden’s Indo-Chinese Nations; yet, in contrast to Leyden’s definition, Crawford emphasised the *insularity* and *tropicality* as essential assets of the region<sup>7</sup>. The subdivisions *within* the region were primarily structured according to

---

<sup>1</sup> See esp. *Leyden 1811*, pp.158-163 & 219-221.

<sup>2</sup> Leyden seems to have presumed that the pagan religions of inland inhabitants of the insular region all possessed some elements of the religions of either Brahma or Buddha, however atavistic these may appear in their present form. (*Leyden 1811*, pp.160-161) Hence, he had already pre-analytically excluded any possibility of the existence of any truly autochthonous religious traits in the region.

<sup>3</sup> With these I refer to the three articles/reviews published in the Edinburgh Review by Crawford: *Of the Eastern Peninsula of India* (1814), *History and Languages of the Indian Islands* (1814), and *Trade of the Indian Islands* (1817a).

<sup>4</sup> See *Crawford 1814b*, e.g. pp.157 (the ingenious Dr. Leyden”), 168 (“From these considerations, I should strongly incline to coincide with DR. Leyden”), 168, & 170.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Marsden 1784*, p.xiii (this is, as far as I am aware the only time Marsden used this term, and it seems not to have been imbued with any specific analytical importance here); *Pinkerton*, Vol.II, p.122; in *Assay 1819* it is included in the title; *Raffles 1817*, Vol.I, p.71; *Mill 1817*, p.10

<sup>6</sup> Harrison thus claimed that “after Crawford, ‘Indian Archipelago’ seems to have established itself firmly in use, until it gave way to ‘Malay Archipelago’ (*Harrison*, p.245); and Bastin stated that: “For all that, the *History of the Indian Archipelago* was an important book mainly because it established the “Indian Archipelago” as an intelligible field of historical study. Crawford’s book brought the term “Indian Archipelago” into general vogue”. (*Bastin 1965*, p.266)

<sup>7</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp.11-13.

civilizational criteria; given Crawford's materialist approach, an assessment of the prevalent stage of civilization was, as seen, causally linked to the aspects of the climate and environment as well.<sup>1</sup>

This focus on stadial civilization rather than on genealogical diffusion facilitated a new comparative framework: instead of only examining the direct genealogical ties and migratory routes, it invited to comparisons across space and not only with the conditions on the Indian subcontinent, consistently denominated Hindustan, but also with the American continent, especially before the European discovery of it. It was even argued that to the New World "in fact, its moral and physical state bore a closer resemblance than any other portion of the globe".<sup>2</sup> Indeed, Crawford had, in a draft to the article on the "Languages and History of the Indian Islands" (1814), twice emphasised the glaring similarities of the levels of civilization and certain cultural traits between the societies inhabiting the Indian Archipelago and particularly the Mesoamerican nations; however, these comparative aspects were absent in the printed version of the article.<sup>3</sup> Whereas Crawford in 1814 explicitly referred to Robertson's "History of America" (1777) as his source of information and inspiration,<sup>4</sup> the authoritative words by 1820 emanated from A. von Humboldt's pen instead; and it especially referred to then fashionable "Political Essay on New Spain".<sup>5</sup> In a comment of Humboldt's description, Crawford explicitly asserted that in "almost every particular connected with progress of manners and society, the Indian islanders and Americans are more like each other than either is to any other race of men, notwithstanding that no rational ground exists for imagining that the least intercourse ever existed between them".<sup>6</sup>

This approach was the exact opposite of the one pursued by J.D. Lang who ascribed all (possible) similarities or parallel traits between the societies inhabiting these two regions as being the result of a direct connection; Lang thus inscribed not only allegedly shared linguistic features and more contingent cultural phenomena into a hyper-genealogical framework, but he also included virtually all apparent similarities in traditions, manners, and modes of social organization.<sup>7</sup> This insistence on a comparative, civilizational framework might also explain why Crawford opted for the term Indian Archipelago rather than the name Malay Archipelago which Marsden had used: apart from the acknowledgement of the *ancient historical* influences on the region emanating from

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp.7-11 & p.14.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.1.

<sup>3</sup> This draft is to be found in the Mackenzie Private Collection in the India Office Records (BL): Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1 (pp.5-75).

<sup>4</sup> Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1, pp.16-17 & 46-47.

<sup>5</sup> Although Crawford mainly cited the "Political Essay", there were also references to "Vues des Cordilleres des Andes par mon. Humboldt et Bonpland" and to "Humboldt's Personal Narrative" (on these references, see e.g. HIA, Vol.I, pp.288, 289, 366 & Vol.III, pp.22, 24, 26, 68, 273, 336, & 340). On the reception of Humboldt in Great Britain, and especially amongst the more radically inclined segments, see *Rupke 1999*.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.22.

<sup>7</sup> See *Lang*.

India,<sup>1</sup> the term *Indian Archipelago* also signalled a dissociation from the analytically privileged position so often ascribed to the coastal Malays, their language, and nation. Although acknowledging the high level of civilization and great influence of the Malays, Crawfurd, nonetheless, focussed on Java as the nexus of civilization in the region, and thus he secured himself a rhetorical position vis-à-vis both Marsden and Raffles who previously had accentuated the position of the Malays.<sup>2</sup>

When Crawfurd addressed the question of language in 1820 he took recourse to Marsden's grand theory of the widely disseminated Polynesian language family which he reiterated with only minor alterations and emendations; in chapter 5 of Book V he devoted almost 50 pages to "General Observations on the Polynesian Languages", and although he already here deviated from Marsden's original interpretation in emphasising the "evidence of an original language with every primitive horde",<sup>3</sup> he nonetheless insisted on the "common circumstance of affinity between all the languages, both of the Indian Archipelago and Australasia, is the great Polynesian";<sup>4</sup> this also comprised the South Seas. As a consequence, Crawfurd's linguistic-geographical approach emulated Marsden's, even though, as we shall see later, their historical, ethnological, and civilizational inferences differed markedly; yet he accepted the same geographical scope as constituting an apt analytical framework. Crawfurd, unlike Marsden, explicitly acknowledged that the idea of such a huge insular zone, sharing kindred languages, was first coined in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century by the Dutch philologist A. Reland;<sup>5</sup> yet as he emphasised: "the learned Reland points out the extraordinary connection between the Malay, the other languages of the Archipelago, and the Madagascar, but he draws no important or interesting conclusion from this singular fact".<sup>6</sup> This was

---

<sup>1</sup> A substantial part of HIA, Vol.II was dedicated to the antiquities on especially Java (in Book VI on "Religion"), and Crawfurd had also published articles in both Transactions of the Batavian Society, Asiatick Researches and in Transactions of the Bombay Literary Society on the vestiges of the Hindu and Buddhist influence on Java as well as on their present existence on Bali; see *Crawfurd 1816*, *Crawfurd 1816/1820a*, *Crawfurd 1816/1820b*, & *Crawfurd 1820b*.

<sup>2</sup> Raffles was obviously also famed for having written on the History of Java – but to Raffles the focal point was much more orientated towards the influence of the Indian subcontinent on Java, as well as on its newer history as adduced from the written Javanese source-material.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.80. Above he had even spoken of the (assumed) original and "distinct language in each tribe". These aspects will be analysed and discussed much more thoroughly in Parts III & IV.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.92.

<sup>5</sup> For more on Reland's orientalist philology, see *Irwin 2008*, p.126. Also at times spelled 'Reeland' or 'Relant'. In *Yanguas*, p.80 it is mentioned that: "Parece ser que el primero en conjeturar el parentesco austronesio, ya en 1706, fue el holandés Hadrian Reland, en un opúsculo titulado "Dissertatio de linguis insularum quarundam orientalium", sobre base de datos filipinos, indonesios, malgaches y los escasos vocabularios de Pacífico obtenidos por Schouten y Le Maire (en 1616)". Yanguas uses the category of 'austranesio' synonymously with that of 'Malayo-Polynesian'. See also *Campbell & Poser*, pp.8-29 & 97-98.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.81. I have only found one reference to Reland in Marsden's texts – when discussing the etymology of the name *Sumatra* (*Marsden 1811*, p.10; this reference did not occur in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of his "History of Sumatra"). Nor do any of the published indexes to his library reveal the presence of any books or tracts authored by Reland.

in stark contrast to Crawford's own approach which, as noted by W. von Humboldt, always intended to achieve exactly that.<sup>1</sup>

### 1.3.4 From Polynesia to Oceania: The Same in All but Name?

Although Crawford was to abide by this geographical framework in the years to come, he did not show the same consistence with the applied nomenclature. When he in 1834, in the earlier mentioned article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, reviewed Marsden's most recent publication on "the Polynesian or East-Insular Languages", all references to Polynesia or Polynesian were glaringly absent in the part of the discourse composed by his own analytical framework.<sup>2</sup> Instead, he now relied on a terminology and accompanying demarcations recently devised by French geographers and explorers who in the meantime had charted many of the hitherto unexplored areas and classified the people living there; especially the boundary zone between the South Seas and the Indian Archipelago had been explored to a hitherto unseen degree.<sup>3</sup> Apart from the travellers themselves, Crawford especially emphasised two metropolitan savants, the young philologist E. Jacquet (1811-1838)<sup>4</sup> and not at least A. Balbi (1782-1848)<sup>5</sup> who Crawford referred to as his source for the term *Oceania* which he implemented in this article as the denominative term for the whole region encompassing Marsden's Polynesia plus Australia. This approach subdivided Oceania "into three great divisions, viz. Malaisia, Australia, and Polynesia".<sup>6</sup> Apart from following the apparently fashionable trends in science, as well as including Australia into the geographical realm of analysis (and thus stressing the importance of the languages of the negro races in the region) the substitution of Marsden's geographical terminology seemed also to have served a rhetorical purpose. Even though Crawford's Oceania was roughly congruent with Marsden's Polynesia in terms of its spatial extension, its definition nevertheless relied on a different set of criteria: whereas Marsden's notion of Polynesia was predominantly a linguistic one, and one that was conceived in terms a genealogical diffusion, Crawford can perhaps have chosen to take recourse to these French

---

<sup>1</sup> *Humboldt 1836*, Vol.I, Book I, p.6: "und überall ist in seinen [i.e. Crawford's] Werken ein kritisches und philosophisches Streben sichtbar, zu sicheren allgemeinen Resultaten zu gelangen."

<sup>2</sup> Both *Polynesia* and *Polynesian* occurred several times in the article (3 and 8 times respectively), yet in almost all instances where the latter term was used, it was when referring to either the titles or the theories of others, like Marsden, W. von Humboldt, or Ellis; *Polynesia* here referred to the geographical entity recently devised by the French explorers and geographers and roughly corresponding to the present use of this term.

<sup>3</sup> See esp. *Douglas & Ballard*, ch.2, *Staum*, and *Liebersohn*, pp.225-230.

<sup>4</sup> With whom Wilhelm von Humboldt also corresponded; see e.g. pp.78-97 in the Appendix entitled "Über den Zusammenhang der Schrift mit der Sprache" attached to Vol.II of *Humboldt 1838*; for more on Jacquet and his connections with Humboldt, see *Reutter*, pp.247-250 & 365-366.

<sup>5</sup> *Staum* has emphasised the importance of the linguistic inclination in Balbi's ethnological-geographical writings. (See *Staum*, e.g. pp.125 & 135)

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1834a*, p.373. In his own works Balbi had quoted Crawford prolifically and in lauding terms: thus, for instance, in *Balbi 1826* we find c.25 references to Crawford and c.10 in *Balbi 1833* (this was the work reviewed in *Crawford 1834*); and, more importantly than the number of references, these were not only confined to information regarding the Indian Archipelago, but they also comprised a general appraisal and discussion of Crawford's approach and theories – that is, regarding the more abstract aspects in the process of knowledge production.

definitions, relying as well on notions race and physical geography, as part of a deliberate strategy of alienating his own position from ‘Marsden’s tradition’; this could have been done in order to create a firmer fundament upon which his linguistic critique of Marsden’s theoretical approach and hypotheses could be launched. Otherwise, if accepting Marsden’s linguistically based demarcations but subsequently refuting the basic premises ingrained in these definitions and demarcations, Crawford’s argument would in best case appear weakened, and in worst case it would seem outright contradictory. By invoking the notion of Oceania instead, Crawford could apply the same analytical scope as Marsden and yet avoid being implicated in its contested conceptual superstructure, the fundament of which he had set out to demolish; this facilitated his appropriation of Marsden’s well-established analytical framework, and subsequently he could structure according to his own ideas on civilization and language.

The same year of 1834 saw the publication of another large tract dealing with these topics, J.D. Lang’s “View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation; Demonstrating Their Ancient Discovery and Progressive Settlement of the Continent of America”. J.D. Lang (1799-1878),<sup>1</sup> who was educated at the University of Glasgow, and later became the first Presbyterian minister in New South Wales, had no personal experience with the region covered by the notion of the Indian Archipelago. His thus relied exclusively on information derived from published material when he conceived his bold hypothesis. Apart from a few exceptions, Lang appeared to accept all aspects of Marsden’s theory on the genealogical dissemination of the Polynesian languages,<sup>2</sup> but he went much further and proceeded to link this vast region to both Eastern Asia as well as to the America; in conjunction they were seen as constituting one vast linguistic zone.<sup>3</sup> Not only did the *Polynesian nation* occupy a position in between these two continents, but, according to Lang, it also provided the crucial stepping stone in the peopling of the Americas. He refuted the plausibility of the commonly accepted ‘Aleutian hypothesis’, originally posed by J. de Acosta in late 16<sup>th</sup> century and which stated that the Americas had been peopled from mainland Asia through Siberia and along the Aleutian Islands,<sup>4</sup> as well as he discarded the hypotheses of an original transatlantic migration and the polygenetic idea of the Amerindians being autochthonous to the continent.<sup>5</sup> Then, by rule of elimination, and supplemented by an intricate set of arguments based on rather idiosyncratic

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on J.D. Lang’s life and career, see the entry in ODNB. (Baker)

<sup>2</sup> Lang, pp.32-36.

<sup>3</sup> Although repeatedly invoking and discussing the competing classifications of race, Lang unequivocally repudiated any essentialist qualities inherent the biological diversities of man (e.g. pp.3-4, 48, & 151), and particularly he defied Blumenbach’s distinction between the Malayan and the Mongol races (p.48).

<sup>4</sup> See the relevant passages in Kidd 2006 and Trigger pp.115-116.

<sup>5</sup> These two hypotheses were formulated in the 17<sup>th</sup> C. by Grotius and I. de La Peyrère respectively. (See Livingstone 2008, pp.26-51 for a political and intellectual contextualization as well as a tracing subsequent impact and receptions)

interpretations of linguistic, antiquarian<sup>1</sup>, and ethnological<sup>2</sup> evidence, Lang discerned that the only possible route through which the Americas could have been peopled was through the Pacific where it was broadest, i.e. along the tropical latitudes! Hence both South- and North America had not merely received their civilization but also their entire population from the Indian Archipelago through the Pacific. T. Ballantyne thus missed the point in Lang's argument when he stated Lang had claimed "that the Pacific was peopled from the Americas"; it was the other way round.<sup>3</sup>

Lang's somewhat eccentric theory would perhaps have been a mere curiosity devoid of any historical value, if it had not been for the intriguing fact that Wilhelm von Humboldt actually evoked a somewhat similar idea of the Indian Archipelago as constituting not a marginal, but centripetal position in the global landscape. H. Aarsleff emphasised that, apart from demonstrating several intriguing aspects of linguistic theory, the study of Kawi, the 'sacred language of Java', was also interesting to Humboldt "by virtue of its geographical location, which linked it to practically all the known languages of the globe, from the African shores of the Indian Ocean to the west across the great archipelago in the middle to the Americas in the east and to China and India on the Asian mainland. In the Kawi he had late in life found the global vantage point he had always aimed for".<sup>4</sup> W. von Humboldt himself spoke of how this "great archipelago extends out under the whole length of Asia, and, bounded to west and east by Africa and America, outflanks it on both sides. Its mid-point [Java] is located at what is still a moderate distance for navigation even from the outermost extremities of the Asiatic mainland. Hence, too, *the three great foci of the earliest cultivation of mankind, China, India, and the seat of the Semitic language-group, have operated in it at different times.* In relatively later periods it has undergone influence from all of them."<sup>5</sup> As we shall see in the two following Parts, this was not the only place where Lang perhaps imitated or emulated aspects in W. Humboldt's approach, although he never referred to him in his writings.

---

<sup>1</sup> With particular emphasis on what by Lang was perceived a characteristic architectural structures in the construction of temples and fortifications.

<sup>2</sup> Apart from a hyper-genealogical interpretation of all apparently shared traditions, customs, and modes of political organization, Lang paid an almost obsessive attention to the horrid and unnatural practice of cannibalism; he perceived this as an essential trait of the societies inhabiting the Pacific and the Americas. He traced its (only possible) origin to the inevitable deprivations occurring when they had to traverse the Pacific Ocean in small canoes – as such it became a criterion of identification of this vast ethnological group, as well as providing further evidence in support of the peopling of the Americas across the Pacific! (see esp. pp.68-75, 122-123, 153 & 162-164). Through this predilection towards indulging in all the gory details of cannibalism at sea Lang was invoking one of the popular topoi of the gothic romanticism; both travel accounts, literature, and the visual arts then abounded in horrifying descriptions of cannibalism, such as, for instance, in the renowned examples of Owen Chase's narrative of the ordeals sustained while traversing large tracts of the Pacific after a sperm whale rammed and sank the Nantucket whaler Essex in 1820, or in E.A. Poe's "The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym" (1838), not to mention Gericault's painting of "the raft of Medusa" (1819).

<sup>3</sup> Ballantyne 2002, p.62; see also p.73.

<sup>4</sup> Aarsleff 1988, p.xii. For W. von Humboldt's own demarcation of the "Wohnplätze und Culturverhältnisse" of the Malay race, see Vol.I, paragraph 1.

<sup>5</sup> Humboldt 1988, §1, p.20 (Corresponding to p.xv, in Humboldt 1836, Vol.I). My italics. "Cultivation of mankind" is translated from Humboldt's "Geistesbildung des Menschengeschlechts".

### 1.3.5 Discerning the Indian Archipelago within the Indian Archipelago.

After the publication of HIA in 1820, the *Indian Archipelago* appeared to have become the most widely used term to denote this region when it was referred to in its totality; not only within the somewhat encircled sphere of the metropolitan scholars and savants, but also amongst the people who wrote on the region while living out there.<sup>1</sup> Although various EIC employed civil servants continued to publish longer texts on Southeast Asia during the 1820s, 1830s, and 1840s,<sup>2</sup> it was no longer the scholar-administrators, or the metropolitan scientists, or the retired gentlemen-scholars who necessarily held the prerogative when it came to defining and demarcating the region as a coherent whole. Instead, this intellectual field became cultivated by private individuals settled in the region – like the sailor, interpreter, and later minor civil servant G.W. Earl (c.1813-1865),<sup>3</sup> and the lawyer and publisher J.R. Logan (1819-1869).<sup>4</sup> Earl can be perceived as a sort of intermediary between the metropole and the colonial periphery; he made an extensive use of the term Indian Archipelago, publishing both in the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society (JRGS)<sup>5</sup> which had been founded by (among others) his, for the time being, ‘patron’ Sir John Barrow,<sup>6</sup> and which had Crawford as one of its members,<sup>7</sup> as well as in the Singapore-based press. This term also appeared in the titles of both his first and his last book, “The Eastern Seas, or Voyages and Adventures in the Indian Archipelago in 1832-1833-1834” (1837) and “The Native Races of the Indian Archipelago: Papuans” from 1853. Earl also contributed with articles to the journal founded by Logan in Singapore in 1847,<sup>8</sup> and which bore the telling title “Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia”<sup>9</sup> (JIA). It seemed indicative of the familiarity of the term Indian Archipelago that neither the “Prospectus”<sup>10</sup> to JIA nor the introductory article written by Logan, “The Present Condition of the Indian Archipelago”, contained any attempts at demarcating the region: it was simply assumed

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the more well known examples was J.H. Moor’s often quoted “Notices of the Indian Archipelago”, consisting mainly, although not exclusively, of a compilation of articles earlier published in the Singapore Chronicle.

<sup>2</sup> With the publications by Anderson (3), Begbie, J. Low, and Newbold as probably the most prominent; in the 1840s these were supplemented by the numerous books and articles on Sir James Brooke’s enterprise in Sarawak.

<sup>3</sup> On Earl’s life and writings, see esp. *Gibson-Hill 1959*, *Turnbull 1971*, *Jones 1973 & Jones 1994* (with important addenda and corrigenda to erroneous information in earlier texts), *Reece, Graham* (ch.8), and *Douglas & Ballard* (ch.3).

<sup>4</sup> Not much has been written on Logan’s life and writings; for a short description, see *Jones 1973*.

<sup>5</sup> On Earl’s publication strategies and, partly failed, attempts to become an ‘insider’ in the metropolitan network on colonial, scientific knowledge, see *Douglas & Ballard*, ch.3.

<sup>6</sup> *Reece*, pp.9-11.

<sup>7</sup> On Crawford’s affiliations to- and involvement in RGS, see *Stafford*, esp. pp.134-140 & 147-152.

<sup>8</sup> Although Logan did not seem to have had the same connections in London as Earl, he did publish at least one article in the JRGS in 1859 entitled “journal of an Excursion from Singapur to Malacca and Pinang”; the author of this article is stated to a “J.R. Lagan”, but it seems clear that it must have been J.R. Logan.

<sup>9</sup> At least with two articles, namely *Earl 1848* and *Earl 1850*. The latter article was also republished “The Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal”, Vol.48 (1850), pp.219-226

<sup>10</sup> Another Prospectus published independently contained 6 additional pages, not included in the Prospectus introducing vol.1 of JIA. The most interesting part of this is its “Scheme of Desiderata for the Indian Archipelago &c.”, delineating the various topics upon which further information was particularly desired as well as the preferred ordering of this information when being into structured knowledge (pp.2-5).



already to be well known amongst the intended readers.<sup>1</sup> Exempting some minor discrepancies regarding the extent to which the western coast of New Guinea and Australia's northern coast should be included in the extent of the Indian Archipelago, the maps accompanying some of the publications on this region also showed a marked consistency in its extension.<sup>2</sup> As pointed out by T. Ballantyne,<sup>3</sup> Logan quite adamantly linked the Indian Archipelago to the Asian mainland, both physically and ethnologically; in the latter context he emphasized that: "again, as we saw that the platform of the Archipelago is but an extension of the great central mass of Asia, and that the direction of the subterranean forces had determined the ranges of the land, so we find that its population is but an extension of the Asiatic families, and that the direction of the migration was marked out by the same forces".<sup>4</sup> When Logan addressed the question of the linguistic and ethnological ties between the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific islands he instead used the term the *Indo-Pacific Islands*, and tugged in between the two geographical entities alluded to in this term lay the Indian Archipelago, hence occupying the central, intermediary position.<sup>5</sup>

Logan and Earl also suggested another name for the Indian Archipelago; they substituted this vernacular compound with the equivalent Greek neologism, and thus they rendered it comparable to the already well established *Polynesia* and the more newly coined *Melanesia* and *Micronesia*.<sup>6</sup> Thence the Indian Archipelago became *Indu-nesia*, or *Indonesia*. The discursive processes leading up to the framing of this term has been carefully studied by R. Jones,<sup>7</sup> yet, given that this term did not gain many adherers in its day, it need not concern us any further here.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Prospectus it was made clear that the intended readership did not solely consist of residents in Singapore and its vicinities; on the contrary, it "will principally be a channel for communicating to European readers" the latest acquired knowledge of the region, and especially, but not exclusively, translations from Dutch sources and in close cooperation with the Batavian Society (Logan 1847, pp.iv-vi). And it achieved that goal – thus not only European readers with a specific interest in the region, as Crawford and H. St. John, but also ethnologists of a more general inclination, like e.g. R.G. Latham, referred frequently to it. References to it in continental learned journals as well indicates that it seems to have obtained a widespread readership despite its lack of any learned society and/or official patrons to bolster its prestige (like for instance the Asiatic Society of the Bengal had had).

<sup>2</sup> See esp. HIA, Earl 1837, Earl 1853, and Crawford 1856. The map accompanying Earl's article in JRGS from 1845 (Earl 1845) formed a partial exception to this trend, but this article differed from the rest, inasmuch as it dealt exclusively the physical geography of the region.

<sup>3</sup> Ballantyne 2002, p.62.

<sup>4</sup> Logan 1847, p.10.

<sup>5</sup> Under the heading "Indo-Pacific Islands" Logan in 1850, in Vol.4 of JIA, embarked upon a linguistic-ethnological project that was to stretch over the next 9 years (up to the publ. of JIA 2<sup>nd</sup> Series Vol.3 in 1859, and occupied more than 1000 pages, excl. vocabularies. That is, a project that until then in volume only seemed to have been outdone by W. von Humboldt's c.2000 pages long "Über die Kawi Sprache" (posthumously publ. 1836-1839)

<sup>6</sup> In was d'Urville who in 1832 had institutionalised the segregation of the Pacific in to Polynesia, Melanesia, and Micronesia; however he did not invent those terms – as we already know de Broses had come up with Polynesia, whereas the names of Melanesia and Micronesia were of a more recent date and first propounded by Bory de Saint-Vincent and D. de Rienzi respectively. The "need" for the primarily *racially founded* geographical distinctions ingrained in these terms arose in the wake of the recent French voyages, in all of which d'Urville himself participated. (See esp. Tcherkézoff and Thomas et al 1989)

<sup>7</sup> See Jones 1973 and Jones 1994. See esp. Jones 1973, pp.101-103 for an illuminative analysis of the process that led to Earl's formulation of the term and Logan's subsequent adaptation of it as a "distinctive name for the brown races of the Indian Archipelago" (Logan quoted in Jones 1973, p.102). Although not successful with this new term, the rationale

### 1.3.6 The Aftermath of the Indian Archipelago in the Metropole.

In a time rife with an incessant urge for new discoveries, a vivid geographical imagination in the naming and connecting of the newly mapped spaces, as well as with several geographical contending concepts, the Indian Archipelago proved perseverant in both notion and name. Not only in Great Britain,<sup>1</sup> but also in the United States<sup>2</sup> and on the European continent<sup>3</sup> did it survive up to the 1860s. Not only within the scholarly circles or in colonial contexts, but also on the more popular scene did it remain popular – as testified in, for instance, the title of William Dalton's boy adventure novel "The Nest hunters; or adventure in the Indian Archipelago" from 1863; in the introduction the author actually paid his homage to the by now more than 40 years old HIA.<sup>4</sup>

In the meantime Crawford had departed from the use of the term Indian Archipelago in his radically reworked and updated follow up to HIA, "A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands & Adjacent Countries" from 1856. No explicit reason was provided for this change of terms, and, apart from references or quotations, the term *Indian Archipelago* seemed only appear very few times as well as in rather insignificant instances;<sup>5</sup> yet, in the introductory remarks Crawford did distinguish between "the Indian and the Philippine Archipelagos" – a demarcation that appeared to be even more enounced in the introductory "Dissertation on the Affinities of the Malayan Language &c &c" from 1852. The distinction was here primarily framed in terms of climatic differences: the Indian Archipelago lay firmly within the monsoon belt, whereas the Philippine Archipelago pertained to the hurricane zone.<sup>6</sup> Ideas on climate, human anatomy, culture, and civilization were

---

that lead to it illustrates the queries that were rife then regarding how most adequately to inscribe this region into the reigning (and contending) paradigms in ethnology and human geography.

<sup>1</sup> Horace St. John's widely popular "The Indian Archipelago: Its History and Present State" (2 vols., 1853) was probably one of the more popular of these.

<sup>2</sup> Manifested e.g. in the titles of the books by Gibson (1855) and the popular one by Bickmore (1869)

<sup>3</sup> For instance the Bonn-based Norwegian-German Orientalist Chr. Lassen thus used this term ("der Indische Archipel") consistently in the 4 volumes of his "Indische Altertumskunde" published between 1847 and 1861 (with an appendix published in 1862) (see e.g. Vol.I, pp.341-352 & pp.462-470 (1847), and Vol.IV pp.460-568) (1861)); a Dutch translation of these parts was published in 1862, "Lassen's geschiedenis van den Indischen archipel". In concordance with Crawford, Lassen treated this geographical unit as a valuable analytical entity, at the same time self-contained and intrinsically linked to both the Asian mainland and to the Pacific realm. "Das Geschlecht der Menschen und Sprachen is ein eigenthümliches. Es ist eine Welt für sich, aber zugleich ein vermittelndes Gebeit für die nahen Festlande" (especially "vorderen Indien", "Hinterindien", and "die südlichste Küste Chinas")... "haben die bewohner des Archipels oder, richtiger der begabtere Theil unter ihnen in dieser Ozeanischen Welt [i.e. 'Oceania'] ihre nächsten Stammverwandten." (Lassen 1847, p.341). For more on Lassen's sources of information on the Indian Archipelago, see Windisch, vol.I, pp.164-197 (on Crawford, esp. p.166 & p.187).

<sup>4</sup> Dalton 1863, p.vii. I have not been able to procure any further information on this author; however, he seems to be yet another one in the string of (early and middle) Victorian authors of adventure literature, like Marryat, Mayne Reid, W.H.G. Kingston, R.M. Ballantyne & G.A. Henty, whose books were primarily directed towards the youth and often with colonial or imperial themes. (On this theme, see e.g. Brantlinger 1988, e.g.pp.47-70, and Brantlinger 2009, e.g. pp.30-35 & 134-147)

<sup>5</sup> I have thus only encountered such references in Crawford 1856, p.194 & 333. The same is the case in his article "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races" from 1848 (Crawford 1848a).

<sup>6</sup> see e.g. Crawford 1852, I, pp.ciii-civ: "The great group of the Philippines, although contiguous to the proper Indian Archipelago, and connected with it by native navigation, differs materially in climate and in the manners of its

then closely interwoven in what D.N. Livingstone calls a *moral discourse on climate*, and which implied that “geographical knowledge of the world’s climatic zones, and the awareness were cast in moral idioms”.<sup>1</sup> Although Crawford did not elaborate more on these aspects in this mainly linguistic context, he was nevertheless instrumental in the development of what J. Hunt, Crawford’s later fellow collaborator in the Ethnological Society and then adversary as the founder of the Anthropological Society, was to dub *ethnoclimatology*.<sup>2</sup> In Crawford’s last publication particularly dedicated to this region, “On the Malayan Race of Man and Its Prehistoric Career”, read before the Ethnological Society in 1868 and published posthumously the year after, he also differentiated between “the Malay and Philippine Archipelagos”.<sup>3</sup> Here he explicitly stated that: “the civilization which arose in Lucon *ought to have been* at least equal to that which arose in Java and Sumatra; and why it was inferior may, I think, *be accounted for by some privations or natural obstacles which contravened its seeming advantages*”.<sup>4</sup> As indicated in its title, the article dealt with the *Malayan race* of man, and this seemed to imply that the topic became essentially disentangled from the Indian subcontinent, since, “the principal race of man inhabiting this new region was peculiar”<sup>5</sup> and considered autochthonous to the region;<sup>6</sup> the influence from the Indian subcontinent was of a historical, and contingent, nature. This was further reified through a higher frequency in civilizational comparisons to the American continent than in references to the influences from Asia. And the ties to the societies inhabiting the isles in the Pacific had also by this time been severed: referring to Prichard’s use of the notion of the Malayo-Polynesian category, Crawford had a few years before commented on “the invented name of a Malayo-Polynesian race, although no such race exists. The term is, in fact, founded upon the superstition that the Malays and the fair natives of the islands of the Pacific are essentially the same race, although the latter be taller than the former by at least a quarter of a foot, and although the language of the two races differ not only in structure but even in words”.<sup>7</sup>

Yet as an analytical entity, the notion of the Indian Archipelago lingered on after Crawford’s own partial abandonment of it, as exemplified in R.G Latham’s article “On the Pagan (non-

---

*inhabitants*. It extends ..., therefore, coming within the rough region of hurricanes, which no part of the Indian Archipelago does.” (My italics)

<sup>1</sup> Livingstone 1991, p.413.

<sup>2</sup> Livingstone 1991, p.416; for more on Hunt see esp. Ellingson, esp. pp.248-262.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1869, p.119; for other examples of this distinction and nomenclature, see pp.122 & 128.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1869, p.129; my italics. Once more the hegemony of the progressionist trope in Crawford’s discourse imposed itself upon the reader: progression constituted the *naturalised* process which any society ‘ought’ to follow, and deviances from this path necessitated some kind of explanation – in casu one based on the climatic differences between the two areas, given the assumed racial identity of the compared societies.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1869, p.133. Despite the insistence on the racial, Crawford nevertheless admitted “what I have endeavoured to show in the course of this essay, and chiefly *through the instrumentality of language*” (p.133).

<sup>6</sup> “We conclude the Malayan race, in short, to be just as much entitled to be considered aborigines as the Negroes [inhabiting the region]” (Crawford 1865a, p.344).

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1865c, p.344.

Mahometan) Populations of the Indian Archipelago”, published in TES in 1861.<sup>1</sup> In this, Latham posited himself in opposition to two other metropolitan ethnologists (Prichard and Crawfurd), and with evidential support drawn from the writings of Earl and Logan<sup>2</sup> he argued that the so-called *eastern Negroes* did not exist at all within the Indian Archipelago proper. Not dwelling too much upon Latham’s mode of reading his sources, nor on his somewhat opportune ignoring of Crawfurd’s theories on the existence of a ‘3<sup>rd</sup> race’ in the region,<sup>3</sup> it should here suffice to remark that – by first deconstructing the any supposed causal linkages between absence of civilization/savagery and race, and then by denying the firm connexion between complexion of skin (plus hair type) and race<sup>4</sup> – Latham subsequently invoked the vague and contested ethnic term *Harafura*<sup>5</sup> in his quest for a discursive extirpation of the *eastern Negroes* from the Indian Archipelago, and thus rendering it not only a linguistically, but also a racially rather homogenous geographical region.<sup>6</sup> Both linguistic and racial differences were inscribed into a gradient scale, rather than being located within a dichotomic framework operating with the existence of two essentially different races in the region. The intertwined relationship between ethnography and geography was further accentuated by Latham’s use of a metaphor that equated the process of charting new seas and islands with that of discovering and describing hitherto unknown people, and concluding that “each and all of the Negrito areas has been disposed of in the satisfactory way that *our imaginary islands* have been disposed” by navigators in earlier days.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Latham, who, trained in both medicine (comparative anatomy) and in comparative linguistics, saw himself as the successor of Prichard, had in 1850 published “The Natural History of the Varieties of Man” and subsequently several other works on both general and more specific topics of ethnology, such as “Man and His Migrations” (1852), “Descriptive Ethnology” (2 vols., 1859), and “Elements of Comparative Philology” (1862).

<sup>2</sup> Who, as Latham rightly stated, “combine a considerable amount of personal knowledge with a familiar acquaintance with the writings of the Dutch authorities” (*Latham 1861*, p.205)

<sup>3</sup> As discussed thoroughly in Part I.

<sup>4</sup> *Latham 1861*, pp.205-206. “That the darkness, however, implies the barbarism [here used rather synonymously with ‘savagery’] is no fact at all; neither is it a fact that the barbarism is connected with the darkness. As little as it is a fact that a dark complexion, even with frizzly hair to boot, makes a negro.”

<sup>5</sup> Latham here especially referred to Leyden’s (lax) use of this term, to Prichard’s racially defined use of it (in his later books), and to the Dutch’s specific meaning of it as denoting a non-Muslim from the Moluccas as an illustration of ambiguous and blurred definitions – and it seems, accompanying blurred realities – of the populations in the region (*Latham 1861*, pp.206-07). Despite an earlier reference to *Crawfurd 1856* (p.204), Latham did not mention that Crawfurd here also stated of the ‘Alforas’ (=‘Harafura’) that it “is not a native word at all, nor is it the generic name of any people whatsoever” (*Crawfurd 1856*, p.10; entry of ‘Alforas’). In the same volume of TES Crawfurd reiterated this assertion in an *Crawfurd 1861c*, p.373. See also *Moore* for a recent analysis.

<sup>6</sup> This assertion however, at least initially, entailed a considerable reduction of the extent of the region the Indian Archipelago, so that the Andamans, the Philippines, and the Malayan peninsula became dissociated from it, due to the (alleged) de facto existence of Negrito tribes there; yet, even their existence (as ‘Negroes’ that is) were in the end cast into doubt by applying the subversive prefix ‘so called’ in connexion with these “so called blacks” (*Latham 1861*, p.211)

<sup>7</sup> *Latham 1861*, p.211.

### 1.3.7 A.R. Wallace's Malay Archipelago: A Return to the Beginning?

Apart from being renowned as the second, albeit lesser famous, 'discoverer' of evolution theory, and subsidiary for his inscription of the (pre)history of mankind into the realms of 'deep time',<sup>1</sup> A.R. Wallace (1823-1913)<sup>2</sup> stands out as the one who succeeded in replacing the term the *Indian Archipelago* with that of the *Malay Archipelago* – the title of his famous book published in 1869. Not that the term was a newly invented one; Marsden, as we have seen, had already used it to describe the approximately same region. But did this actually imply that the circle was closed: that Marsden's and Wallace's Malay Archipelagos were not just co-extensional but also identical?

A closer examination of Wallace's methodological approaches, theories, and referential framework will prove that this was not the case. J. Vetter has recently examined the intellectual and colonial contexts of Wallace's conceptualization and empirical mapping of the dividing line that demarcated the Malay zone from the Papuan one; a demarcation line just like the more famous one that divided the Asian fauna from the Australasian and which still bears his name.<sup>3</sup> Vetter emphasized that "mapping an ethnological borderline was one way to cope with local variability, but it was not the only possible solution. Wallace could have constructed a continuous gradient variation from west to east [as Latham seemed to advocate], or he could have simply correlated physical characteristics with stages in social evolution [as Prichard had done in 1813, or as Crawfurd<sup>4</sup> also, as seen, did]".<sup>5</sup>

Despite not possessing any formal education and being employed as a mere collector of plants and animals,<sup>6</sup> Wallace nonetheless carved out a position for himself as a *field scientist* who, through the use of the practises of survey science (his original training), was able "raise the status of field work by combining fact gathering with higher-level generalising".<sup>7</sup> However, he was away from the metropolitan networks while conceiving these theories and here he worked in secluded solitude; this seemed to imply that he could not draw upon some of the more modern ethnological methodologies. Instead he took recourse to the observational and classificatory modes of the naturalist: mankind was assessed as yet another natural being, and linguistic features played only second fiddle in an approach orchestrated around the assumed primacy of physical nature.<sup>8</sup> And, in conjunction with

---

<sup>1</sup> See esp. *Trautmann 1992* and *Stocking 1987*, pp.69-74.

<sup>2</sup> On Wallace's travels in the Malay Archipelago and his general contributions to the anthropological knowledge, see *Bastin 1986*, *Stocking 1987* (pp.96-102), *Raby* (pp.75-123 & 148-177), and *Boon* (pp.12-25).

<sup>3</sup> See *Vetter 2006* and *Vetter 2009*; on the chronology of the origin of the two lines, see *Vetter 2006*, p.101.

<sup>4</sup> On the fundamental differences between Prichard's and Crawfurd's approaches and theories, see Part I.

<sup>5</sup> *Vetter 2006*, p.103.

<sup>6</sup> Wallace had earlier spent several years (1848-1852) collecting specimens along the Amazon River together with other renowned collectors as H. Bates and R. Spruce (see esp. *Raby*, pp.75-123).

<sup>7</sup> *Vetter 2006*, p.89.

<sup>8</sup> Wallace did however also collect different vocabularies, and *Wallace 1869* had an appendix attached "On the Crania and the Languages of the Races of Man in the Malayan Archipelago". But, as emphasized in *Wallace 1865*, Wallace did "conceive that the evidence of language is quite subsidiary to that of physical and moral characteristics.... Its true

the physical features, Wallace also added a set of allegedly directly observable moral and mental traits that were assumed to constitute just as essential racial attributes as the outright physical ones.<sup>1</sup> Based on these premises Wallace defined and determined a racial demarcation line between the zone inhabited by the *Malay race* and the domain of the *Papuan race*; that is, a Malay Archipelago and an eastern, or a Papuan, ditto that gradually was dissolved into the Pacific,<sup>2</sup> and it was considered that “this division of the Oceanic races to be a true and natural one”.<sup>3</sup> Regarding the affinities of these two zones, Wallace unequivocally linked the Malay Archipelago to the Asian mainland: “the Malayan race, as a whole, undoubtedly very closely resembles physically the East Asian populations, from Siam to Mandchouria”<sup>4</sup> – it was thus no longer the Indian-, but the Mongol connection that was stressed.<sup>5</sup> The recurring problem of the existence of the so-called Negritos on the Andaman Islands, in the interior of the Malay peninsula and on Luzon was “solved” by arguing that, although they were “no doubt quite a distinct race from the Malay”, “they have no affinity or resemblance whatever to the Papuans” and “in most important characters they differ more from the Papuan than they do from the Malay”.<sup>6</sup> This paved the way for defining the Papuan and the Negrito as two different and unconnected races,<sup>7</sup> and for ascribing an Asian origin to the Negritos. The Papuans, on the other hand, were perceived as pertaining to the same “great Oceanic or Polynesian race” as the lighter skinned inhabitants of the Pacific islands; as a result Wallace did not evoke the Polynesian-Melanesian divide coined by d’Urville but, on the contrary, inscribed these two into a framework of a continuous gradient variation without any fixed borderline. The origin of this *great oceanic race* was deemed autochthonous to the Pacific and as “descended from the inhabitants of a land which has now in great part sunk beneath the ocean”.<sup>8</sup>

---

importance seems to be in tracing those *recent migrations of tribes and intermixture of races* of which we have no more direct evidence” (p.214).

<sup>1</sup> This composes a central part of the argument in Vetter 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Here Wallace chose to inscribe it into a framework of a continuous gradient variation and not of a fixed borderline.

<sup>3</sup> Wallace 1865, p.211; this was verbatim repeated in Wallace 1869, p.592.

<sup>4</sup> Wallace 1865, p.211 & Wallace 1869, p.592.

<sup>5</sup> See Keevak, esp. pp.57-69.

<sup>6</sup> Both in Wallace 1865, p.209.

<sup>7</sup> Wallace’s adaptation of the notion of a much deeper temporal framework than hitherto normally applied in British ethnological discourses facilitated an epistemological merger between the insistence on racial essentiality, normally associated with the polygenist stance, and the assumption of an ulterior monogenetic origin of man: although originally one, the eons of time could have established essential racial entities amongst different groups of men, inhabiting divergent environments and climatic zones. “Accepting however most gratefully, the permission we now have to place the origin of man at an indefinitely remote epoch, our difficulties are in a great measure removed, and we can speculate more freely on the parentage of tribes and races.” (Wallace 1865, p.210). For an elaboration of these ideas, see Wallace 1865; this article was published in the journal of the competing Anthropological Society (JAS), and as such it is also emblematic for Wallace’s “middle position” between those societies (see Vetter 2009, pp.2-5 & 11-13, and Stocking 1987, pp.96-102).

<sup>8</sup> Both of these quotes are from Wallace 1865, p.212. As additional evidence in favour of this hypothesis Wallace evoked Darwin’s ‘coral reef theory’, as stated in his “The Voyage of the Beagle” (see Darwin, pp.442-457) and the distribution of animals among these islands. In Wallace 1869, this categorical interpretation was softened up a bit, and Wallace by now admitted that “it is, however, quite possible, and perhaps probable, that the brown Polynesians were originally the produce of a mixture of Malays, or some lighter coloured Mongol race, with the dark Papuans; but if so,

## 1.4 Conclusive Remarks.

Wallace's *Malay Archipelago* thus differed from Marsden's *Malay Archipelago* in some fundamental aspects: whereas Marsden perceived the Malay Archipelago as an integrated part of the vast insular zone between Madagascar and Easter Island and which he baptised Polynesia, the Malay Archipelago encountered in Wallace's text seemed intimately linked to the Asian mainland both in terms of human geography and the distribution of animals and plants, and its was sharply dissociated from the Papuan *and* Polynesian peoples. Furthermore, there was an even greater discrepancy in terms of the methodological premises upon which these geographical superstructures rested; Marsden's Polynesia was composed on a purely linguistic foundation – for Marsden, it was through the medium of language that the oldest parts of human history could be accessed and the subsequent migratory patterns be discerned. Operating with a much deeper temporal framework, language in Wallace's approach became reduced to a mere surface phenomenon, only revealing much more recent events than the ones that were hidden beneath the skin in the physiological setup of man; as stated by Huxley, also Wallace found that ethnology was most of all a branch of zoology and that “neither language nor artifacts offer reliable evidence about the real differences between the human races or about their past”.<sup>1</sup> In between these two extremes of the scale, both temporally and analytically, arose the notion of the Indian Archipelago. It was based on a multi-tiered approach, including recognition of (1) the presence and importance of the historical connection with India,<sup>2</sup> (2) a racial linking with the Mongol part of Asia, as Cuvier had claimed, or the notion of an aboriginal race, as argued by Blumenbach, and (3) linguistically it was perceived as composing a part of the great Polynesian language zone,<sup>3</sup> albeit the more civilized societies had undeniably absorbed many words and accompanying concepts from the Indian subcontinent, as noticed already by Marsden, later stressed by Crawfurd, and which constituted the very *raison d'être* for W. von Humboldt's analytical focus on the Kawi language. Once the assumption of the shared linguistic origin began to be challenged – either as being erroneous, or as representing a rather irrelevant fact – the concept of the Indian Archipelago became gradually obsolete; even Crawfurd himself, who after at least 1834 partook in these assaults, either abandoned the term altogether or restricted its geographical and analytical scope markedly in his later writings.

---

the intermingling took place at such a remote epoch, and has been so assisted by the continued influence of physical conditions and of natural selection, leading to the preservation of a special type suited to those conditions, that it has become a fixed and stable race with no signs of mongrelism, and showing such a decided preponderance of Papuan character, that it can best be classified as a modification of the Papuan type.” (p.594; my italics)

<sup>1</sup> Brantlinger 2003, p.171; on Huxley's ethnology, see pp.170-177.

<sup>2</sup> Such as it was testified in both ancient texts, in the antiquarian vestiges such as ruined monuments with their characteristic architecture, depictions, and inscriptions, as well as in the presently existing language.

<sup>3</sup> Whether related in terms of a genealogical language family or due to later dissemination was a contended issue, as we shall examine thoroughly in the next two parts.





## 2. The Vicissitudes of Southeast Asian Chronologies.

Although the spatial mapping and subsequent naming of this region constituted a contested field, the possibility of executing this mapping had never been cast into doubt; the importance vested in the various influential factors of physical geography, climate, race, history, language &c. in determining the essence, affiliations, and boundaries of the region might have been moot, but the faith in the necessity and the feasibility of the project remained intact throughout the entire period.

It was different with the temporal aspect inherent in the chronological project, however. A chronological mapping presupposed the existence and availability of trustworthy historical data; this could by its very nature only be approached indirectly through inferences from various kinds of source-material, and not accessed through the more direct means of observation, measurement, or interaction.<sup>1</sup> This implied that if no such source-material was considered sufficiently reliable, then a credible historical dating could not be obtained, and this ultimately endangered the feasibility of the whole chronological project. Yet abandoning the project seemed never to have been contemplated seriously, for, as Rosenberg and Grafton rightly pointed out, “genealogy and chronicle are not primitive efforts to write what would become history in other hands, but powerful, graphically dense ways of describing and interpreting the past.”<sup>2</sup>

### 2.1 Chronological Principles and Methods.

Chronological series can be discerned in principally two manners: either in terms of establishing a relative chronology, or it can be achieved through the foundation of an absolute dating of the studied events or phenomena.<sup>3</sup> Unless some kind of absolute fixpoint was obtainable it would be impossible to correlate the relative chronology of one region or nation to the chronologies of other already known nations, and ultimately to inscribe it into the Biblical-Roman framework, such as it was prescribed in the premises of the chronological project.<sup>4</sup> In this context, the crude relative chronological order – either discerned from linguistic evidence existent in contemporary spoken languages,<sup>5</sup> or deduced from the assumed natural and universal order of progress inherent in the

---

<sup>1</sup> This former process thus corresponds, *mutatis mutandis*, to what J. Stagl in his scheme of ‘basic research methods’ denominates *indirect exploration via significant phenomena*, inasmuch as (the vestiges of the) past only can be read through a presently present ‘significant phenomenon’ (text, symbolic relic, living language, etc.) that is perceived to refer to, or to be imbued with, the past. (see *Stagl 1995*, pp.3-4 & 6-7)

<sup>2</sup> *Rosenberg & Grafton*, pp.12-13.

<sup>3</sup> On the burgeoning discussions of the notion of a *prehistorical* period, and the associated application of ‘scientific’ methods in the relative (as well as the tentative steps towards an absolute) dating of the prehistoric phenomena, see *Rowly-Conwy, Trigger* (pp.121-138), and *Schnapp* (esp. pp.275-314). I will discuss this further in Part IV.

<sup>4</sup> See *Kejariwal*, ch.1 for some examples of this project in India. See also *Trautmann 2009*, pp.172-178 and *Keay 2001*.

<sup>5</sup> As an example of this mode of inference can be mentioned how Crawford in HIA reconstructed the relative sequence of the development of the production of textiles in the Indian Archipelago: since the word for cotton in all the languages in the region was derived from Sanskrit this indicated that the cultivation and practical use of this fabric was originally introduced from India, probably with the establishment of the Hindu- and Buddhist kingdoms in the region. Yet all the

stadial theories of civilization – was not to much avail. The chronological project relied on what was perceived to offer a firmer foundation, and which would primarily be discerned from literary evidence, or subsidiary it could be adduced from precisely datable artefacts, or in particular from monuments, decipherable inscriptions, coins, etc.. These types of source-material were primarily assessed within the disciplines of philology and antiquarianism, both of which occupied essential positions within the established fields of orientalist knowledge production.

But if written source-material was either absent, or if the literary content of it was deemed to be deprived of any reliable historical value, except from what they indirectly told regarding the material and mental culture at the *time of the composition of the works* (rather than on the period that they purportedly described), then the chronological project in the strict sense of the word became increasingly difficult, and recourse to other methods of mapping the temporal dimension had to be taken. Such as inscribing the region into the stratified realms of natural history of man instead of focussing on the unique trajectories delineated in historical narratives. However, the moot point here was to what extent the literary content of the admittedly existent written source-material produced in the region, and primarily of ‘indigenous’ provenance, could be counted credible. Right from his first published writings on the region in 1814 and up the last publication in 1869 Crawford offered his views on this problem and keenly contributed to the contemporary debates on this issue.

In the British discourses on the chronology of Indian Archipelago, the problems of identifying and dating the decisive historical events seemed particularly to revolve around four historical topics:

- The question of who originally had peopled the region; when did this happen, to what race or nation did they pertain, what language did they speak, and how advanced were they in terms of civilization?
- When, how, and why did the influence from the Indian subcontinent reach this region; from where in India did these travels originate, and to what extent did their language, religion, social organization, and stage of civilization permeate the societies inhabiting the Indian Archipelago?
- What was the original location of the Malay *nation*; when did it begin to spread across the region, along what routes, and how could this inherent migratory pattern of the Malay nation be accounted for?
- The establishment of a chronology covering the more recent history of the region.

---

words associated with the art of weaving – to spin, to weave, the loom, the shuttle, the woof, and the warp – were of Polynesian provenance; this implied that the art of weaving was known in this region *before* the introduction of (the use of) cotton from India; on this basis Crawford then proceeded to surmise what kinds of clothes that might have been produced in the original Polynesian society before the influences from India (HIA, Vol., pp.176-181 & 206-209).

## **2.2 Identifying the First Inhabitants in the Indian Archipelago.**

The main queries addressed in this context concerned who were the first inhabitants in the region, when and from whence did they come, if they were not to be considered aboriginal in a strict sense of the word; and especially when and where did the Polynesian nation and/or civilization, associated with this language group, originate? Due to the assumed very remote period in which these events took place, most writers discarded the inclusion of indigenous written source-material; nor were the encountered grand monuments, their inscriptions, or other material artefacts of any avail, given that these were assumed to have been produced at a much later date too. Most of them were dated to the period of Hindu- and Buddhist kingdoms on especially, but not exclusively, Java. This implied that, instead of embedding this topic within the realm of history, recourse had to be taken to the fields delineated by the stadial analysis of conjectural history as well as ethnology's linguistic and racial fields. This invariably posited these events in the "remotest past"<sup>1</sup> which, despite the shallow notion of time commonly accepted by most of the authors in question, could not be determined further due to the absence of any fixpoint that could link the relative chronology of this region to already known chronologies. The extensive, and heatedly contested, production and use of linguistic evidence in determining when and, if possible, from where the people who inhabited region came will be examined in further detail in the Part.

One exception to this pattern, however, was the opinion advanced by J.D. Lang whose genealogical approach allowed an inscription of the Indian Archipelago into the global framework of the Biblical narrative. Unlike Sir W. Jones, who in the spirit of moderate Enlightenment,<sup>2</sup> maintained a Biblical-genealogical framework to which his more "discrete" ethnological-linguistic researches ultimately were related,<sup>3</sup> the Presbyterian Lang took a much more literal approach to the authority of the Scriptures when he wrote this text in the 1830s: whereas Jones merely had intimated a Sanskrit origin of the (in Marsden's terminology) Polynesian languages,<sup>4</sup> and then claimed that the highly civilized Sanskrit speaking societies of India originally stemmed from the

---

<sup>1</sup> Raffles thus asserted that any dating of these events would be impossible since this period "at best is involved in so much obscurity and fable, that much must be left to conjecture". (*Raffles 1817*, Vol.I, p.369)

<sup>2</sup> C. Kidd has convincingly, I think, argued that, at least in the Anglo-Saxon setting, this 'moderate Enlightenment' was much more predominant in both dissemination and political influence than the more radical version (to use J. Israel's terms) was (*Kidd 2006*, pp.79-84). In Jones's case, the context of this moderate Enlightenment and its impact upon his approaches and theories has been analysed by Trautmann (see esp. *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.28-61).

<sup>3</sup> That Sir W. Jones operated with referential framework grounded in Biblical genealogy, and that his theories were imbued with such notions, did not imply that his methodological approaches primarily relied on the authority of the Scriptures; on the contrary, he stressed that he methodologically had treated the Scriptures as any other (secular) text (*Trautmann 1997/2004*, p.51). Although, the study of language was always by Jones always perceived only as a means, and never as an end in itself, it was in his methodological approach that he was truly innovative and left a lasting legacy (*Aarsleff 1966/1983*, pp.123-134).

<sup>4</sup> *Jones 1824*, p.139.

descendants of Ham,<sup>1</sup> Lang invoked the Biblical genealogy not only as a referential framework but also as an integrated part of the *evidence* provided in support of his argument. This facilitated an absolute dating of the first migrations to-, and later from, the Indian Archipelago.

Lang initially dismissed the whole idea of the natural progress of civilization from savagery to refinement;<sup>2</sup> instead, on the basis of evidence derived from the Scriptures, he deduced that Eastern Asia had originally been peopled by a civilized people at roughly the same period as when the Pharaohs ruled Egypt. That is, at the remotest ages, immediately after the Deluge. Operating strictly within the temporally shallow notion of Biblical time, Lang argued that man was originally *not* primitive,<sup>3</sup> but on the contrary that the “earlier postdiluvian nations” “so far from being in a state of comparative barbarism, as is generally, though gratuitously, supposed, had attained a considerable degree of civilization, and that they had derived that civilization from on common source”.<sup>4</sup> Lang’s argument was thus not only based on a Biblical framework and relied on a hyper-genealogical mode of explanation, but it was also embedded within the trope of degeneration of mankind;<sup>5</sup> only influences from the outside, from more civilized neighbouring or conquering societies, could revert this degenerating trajectory and infuse progress.<sup>6</sup> Upon this rationale Lang offered various types of (quasi)linguistic evidence<sup>7</sup> in support of his hypothesis, claiming that the first inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago, and later of the Pacific isles too, originally stemmed from the Asiatic mainland. Acknowledging that such evidence could only at best provide a relative dating, Lang took recourse to the evidence provided by survived monuments (“tumuli”) of what he deemed to be temples belonging to the original monotheistic religion, before the religious sentiments that imbued all mankind deteriorated into idolatrous worshipping. Thus it was assessed that the ruins of the temples in the Indian Archipelago, the apparent vestiges of such in the pacific, and the Pyramids encountered on the American continent invariably must have originated relatively shortly after the

---

<sup>1</sup> Whereas the descendants of Ham traditionally were identified as the Black inhabitants of Africa, Sir W. Jones identified them to have been the inventors and disseminators of original civilization, and Ham was thus also the progenitor of the Sanskrit speaking ancient Indians. (p.49) Trautmann stressed the importance of situating Sir W. Jones’s theories within their contemporary context, where they primarily were articulated in concordance with J. Bryant’s genealogical system as well as in opposition to his etymological methods (*Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.41-46).

<sup>2</sup> *Lang*, p.89 (my italics): “It is an easy and *natural process for man to degenerate* in the scale of civilization”.

<sup>3</sup> *Lang*, p.90.

<sup>4</sup> *Lang*, p.204. And “if man had been a savage at first, he would have remained a savage forever.” (p.90)

<sup>5</sup> An ingrained problem in such a categorically degenerationist framework (at least when *degeneration* refers to civilization) is that, if progress can only be obtained through influence from the outside, then this must logically imply that these early postdiluvian societies must have been as least as civilized as the most advanced modern state, viz. the contemporary British society, if not more so! That is, unless *outside influence* also includes some kind of divine interference. Lang did not address this question explicitly here. For more on the debates on the notions of progress and degeneration within both secular and religious discourses, as well as in their intersections, see *Spadafora*.

<sup>6</sup> *Lang*, pp.89-90.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. *Lang*, pp.40-49 & 137-159.

Deluvion; or at roughly the same time as when the pyramids in Egypt were built.<sup>1</sup> When compared with known Chinese chronologies,<sup>2</sup> this implied, in terms of chronology, “that the first discoverers of America landed on the West coast of that continent, somewhere near the isthmus of Panama, *at least from a thousand to fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ*”.<sup>3</sup>

Despite initially being dressed in the cloak of a secular scientific discourse,<sup>4</sup> the latter part of the treatise clearly revealed that Lang’s text – with its staunch Biblical premises, degenerationist dynamics, and hyper-genealogical mode of argumentation – pertained more to the category of writings recently analysed by C. Kidd and D.N. Livingstone,<sup>5</sup> than to the more ‘pragmatic’ field of colonial knowledge production pursued by the scholar-administrators. Yet in its day it was reviewed in a scientific journal as the J.R.G.S. which probably could be seen as a sort of stamp of approval in terms of its attributed ‘scientific’ hue, if not necessarily of the value of the hypothesis per se.<sup>6</sup>

The fundamental differences between the works published in 1834 by Lang, Marsden, and Crawford was also reflected in discrepancies of the discourses in which these early migrations were inscribed. Thus, in Lang’s evocative language “the Indian Archipelago and the Western Pacific were traversed in all directions *by the beautifully carved galleys of that maritime people*, long before Agamemnon and his brother chiefs had conducted their hordes of semi-barbarous Greeks to the siege and pillage of Troy”.<sup>7</sup> This image of a golden past was clearly contrasted in Marsden’s sober and cautious prose where it was laconically stated that “with respect to any probable or even plausible mode in which this extraordinary sameness of language has been diffused, *we are entirely in the dark*, and likely, I apprehend, to remain so”; all that could be stated with certainty was that “such *may* have been their commercial adventures cannot be questioned, but nothing like original, native authority for the has yet been discovered”, and hence “the whole is matter of inference and conjecture only”<sup>8</sup> – the dissemination of the Polynesian languages was a fact, the accompanying

---

<sup>1</sup> Lang, pp.209-210. By initiating the inference with the words: “In short, there is reason to believe...”, Lang seemed to suggest that this was only a surmised dating; yet the frequency of its repetition and the increasing confidence with which it was mentioned indicated that Lang nevertheless attributed it with a greater certainty than originally intimated.

<sup>2</sup> The Chinese civilization was traditionally considered of a very ancient date; some, like J. Webb (late 17<sup>th</sup> C.), had suggested that Noah immediately after the Flood had migrated to China, and hence Chinese constituted the primitive language of man (Eco 1995, p.91 & Kidd 2006, p.60).

<sup>3</sup> Lang, p.238; see also p.232.

<sup>4</sup> The fundamentally Biblical inclinations of Lang’s approach was however revealed by the manner in which he consistently labelled the progressionist approach of conjectural history as being “infidel” (e.g. Lang, pp.91, 137, 151, & 173). The rhetorical animosity evinced towards this approach was thus even more inimical than his scepticism towards the polygenist ideas of, for instance the German naturalist C.F.P. von Martius and, albeit in a more diluted form by A. von Humboldt (see e.g. pp.185 & 232 – thus von Martius’s theory was described as an “utterly gratuitous hypothesis”).

<sup>5</sup> See esp. Livingstone 1992b and Kidd 2006.

<sup>6</sup> It was also reviewed rather favourably in the *Monthly Review* 1834 and discussed by many other contemporaries, e.g. by T. Hodgkin (in Hodgkin 1835). These aspects are discussed much more at length in Part IV.

<sup>7</sup> Lang, p.210. My italics.

<sup>8</sup> Marsden 1834, pp.78-79. My italics (except in the case of ‘may’).

migrations of people considered a corollary to this, but the means whereby it happened and the period in which it took place remained obscure.

Crawfurd, however, did not abstain from committing himself more unequivocally to such inferences and conjecture than Marsden did: “the difficulty of rationally accounting for it [the dissemination of the Oceanic] languages is great”, yet it “must not, however, be left in the condition of miracle or wonder: we must therefore make the attempt” to account for it. Thus the mode of dissemination was described as being more or less the gratuitous result of the prevailing winds “which in the course of ages would carry *even frail native praos from one island to another*, and thus propagate the common language”;<sup>1</sup> and with regard to the dissemination of the Oceanic languages to far away Madagascar it was contended that “it tends to illustrate the manner in which migration and dissemination of language may have taken place within the Oceanic region itself”, by being, it was assumed,<sup>2</sup> the random result of boats adrift, the crews of which were only being kept alive by “the accidental presence of in their boats of a few cocoa nuts”.<sup>3</sup> The utterly unplanned arbitrariness of the peopling of especially the Pacific became even more enounced in his “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malayan Language” from 1852 where this extraordinary dissemination was accounted for through the invocation of a suggestive analogy to nature itself: “for the presence of Malayan words in the languages of the Pacific and in that of Madagascar, it must be admitted, *appears more to resemble that of certain plants conveyed to distant shores, by winds, currents, or accident*, than the *ordinary migrations of man* in other parts of the world”.<sup>4</sup> Apart from the divergent interpretive frameworks and approaches, as well as the dissenting views on the evidence presented in the scholarly argumentations, Lang’s proud captains of stout galleys were, indeed, also worlds apart from Crawfurd’s primitive castaways, entirely at the mercy of the capricious nature.

### **2.3 Identifying and Dating the Influences from India.**

Unlike Sir W. Jones’s tracing of a Sanskrit origin of the Polynesian languages, most of the later scholar-administrators who wrote on the Indian influence upon the Indian Archipelago followed Marsden’s trail and prescribed (the influential part of) it to later, historical times. Not much

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1834a*, p.402. ‘Prau’, or ‘proa’, ‘prau’, or nowadays more commonly ‘prahu’ is the generic term usually bestowed upon all kinds of natively constructed sailing vessels within the realms of Malaysia and Indonesia. (see also the entry under “prau” in *Crawfurd 1856*, and for a modern description, see *Horridge 1986*).

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd adduced, in support of this hypothesis, recently observed instances of prahus from Sumatra that were caught by the current and the winds and whose crews were brought all the way to Madagascar: what happened now could also have happened in the distant past. Marsden, on the other hand, did not consider such “accidental settling there of crews of tempest-driven praws from Sumatra or Java” a sufficient explanation for the undisputed evidence of the dissemination of Polynesian languages to this island (*Marsden 1834*, p.32 & *Crawfurd 1834a*, pp.404-405).

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1834*, p.404.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawfurd 1852*, Vol.I, p.cclxxxviii; my italics.

influenced by earlier Dutch examinations,<sup>1</sup> the British brought with them their recent experiences from the “discovery” of India’s past. Nowhere did this manifest itself more transparently than in the case of Col. C. Mackenzie;<sup>2</sup> already well versed in the examination of Indian Antiquities through his thorough excavations of vestiges of temples &c. in especially South India while officially being occupied with the Mysore Survey,<sup>3</sup> Mackenzie ascribed the same function to the researches on the history of Java and the other parts of the Indian Archipelago as it had had in India, viz. by “a laudable research into history, laws, customs, and literature, to assist the [indigenous] rulers to protect the subjects and ameliorate their condition *by a more perfect knowledge of their own institutions*”.<sup>4</sup> Just like the earliest British orientalists had claimed to discover the original, ancient laws in India, and then had sought to implement these as the authoritative mode of governance in their colonial administration of India by representing them as incarnating the true essence of India,<sup>5</sup> the discovery of the past history of the Indian Archipelago could be imputed with the same political function and ideological implications. This obviously implied that the prerogative of the definition of the ‘true essence’ of Java, as well as of the other parts of the Indian Archipelago, was taken away from the natives themselves and transferred to the British scholar-administrators.

This process was even more pronounced in the Indian Archipelago since the societies inhabiting this region were deemed deprived of any genuine recollection of their own past. Java’s reputedly historical works were thus considered as nothing but ballads full of mythological fable, and their content was considered devoid of any information of intrinsic historiographical value; according to Crawfurd at least when dealing with the period before roughly AD 1100-1300,<sup>6</sup> or AD 900 according to Raffles<sup>7</sup>. This implied that the allegedly unreliable, written source-material had to be

---

<sup>1</sup> On the Dutch interest in the history of their East Indian Possessions and the establishment of the Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen (Batavian Society) in 1778, as the first of its kind in Asia, see *Diaz-Andreu*, pp.215-217 and *Groot*. In 1814 Crawfurd had claimed that the Dutch had “hardly contributed, in any manner, to the elucidation of its history, literature, or manners”. (*Crawfurd 1814a*, p.151) Although this denial of the existence of a Dutch knowledge production comprised one of the main points of criticism in Jambulus’s review of Crawfurd’s review (MSS EUR K239/5, pp.122-130), both Raffles and Mackenzie seemed to concur, at least partially, with Crawfurd’s assertion (*Raffles 1817*, Vol.II, pp.5-6 & *Mackenzie 1813*, pp.xxvi-xxvii), even though Raffles in reality referred to Dutch writings several times in his “History of Java”, and Mackenzie’s “Private Collection” contained several Dutch manuscripts on the History of Java or Dutch translations of native histories. So, whether true or not, amongst the British it was a literary commonplace to assert that the historiography of the former Dutch possessions constituted an intellectual terra nullius. See also *Marshall 1988* and *van Niel* for analyses of this topic.

<sup>2</sup> See also *Kouznetsova*.

<sup>3</sup> On Mackenzie’s surveys, excavations, and collection of antiquities in India, see *Keay 2000*, pp.23-25, *Keay*, pp.179-182, *Edney* (many references, see esp. pp.152-155), *Dirks 1993*, and *Cohn 1996*, pp.76-105.

<sup>4</sup> *Mackenzie 1813*, p.xxviii.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Cohn’s essay “Law and the Colonial State in India”, in *Cohn 1996*, pp.57-75.

<sup>6</sup> In his “A short sketch of the native history of Java” from 1814 (BL Add. 30353/4), Crawfurd stated that “What in them [the Javanese] might be deemed *true history*, does not embrace a period of more than five centuries” (p25); that is, c.1300. In HIA he contended that the “latter portion of the twelfth century is the earliest period of Javanese history to which I can with any confidence refer.” (Vol.II, p.297)

<sup>7</sup> *Raffles 1817*, p.64. In terms of credibility of the written sources, Raffles distinguished between three epochs: (1) Before the 9<sup>th</sup> C., regarding which the descriptions are “confused, obscure, contradictory, and interpolated with fabulous and heroic histories of continental India”; (2) from the 9<sup>th</sup> C. to c.1475, and “from that epoch they correspond

either supplemented with- or substituted entirely by antiquarian examinations of architecture and inscriptions, as well as by the inferences drawn from the (assumed) religious ideas and abstract notions expressed in these.

Raffles was most adamant in pursuing the studies of the remnants of the first ancient Indian settlements on Java, and he eagerly advocated that to “trace the sources from whence this colonization and consequent civilization flowed, and the periods at which it was introduced into different states, is a subject new to the historian, and not uninteresting to the philosopher”.<sup>1</sup> To Raffles, being left by Lt. Minto in charge of the newly conquered Dutch East Indian possessions, this apparently *naturalised* conjunction between a “colonization and consequent civilization”, emanating from India in ancient times, was undoubtedly saturated with contemporary political connotations as well, given that the British also conquered Java from India, and that Raffles, and with him many kindred spirits, including Crawfurd, intended to colonise and civilize it too. Hence, what O.P. Kejariwal has termed *the concept of Greater India*,<sup>2</sup> can in this context be interpreted as an ideological legitimisation, bolstered by allegedly neutral historical and antiquarian studies, for a British colonization and civilization of Java and the adjacent isles. As Lt-Governor on Java, Raffles sponsored the various expeditions by, amongst others, Mackenzie and Capt. Baker<sup>3</sup> to survey and describe the ancient ruins of Bóro Bódo (Borobudur) and Brambánan (Prambanan); these descriptions were included in his “History of Java” (1817), alongside the lavish aquatint reproductions of the picturesque ruins of these temples;<sup>4</sup> in time these construed images came to constitute the paradigmatic romantic representations of elegant tropical decay, and they would set the standard for observing and presenting ruins in the tropics.<sup>5</sup>

Although Crawfurd would later, and in other contexts, stress the geographical and civilizational autonomy of the zone composed by the Indian Archipelago, he also drew attention to the tight historical ties between the Indian subcontinent and the Indian Archipelago – and in particular to Java. Whereas he as a *colonial administrator* wrote, for instance, “A short sketch of the native history of Java”, based on Javanese written source-material and dealing with the more recent

---

essentially”; (3) after 1475, where “they are circumstantial, and claim attention, not only as illustrative of the character of the people, but as historical records of the transactions of the times”. See also *Weatherbee and Aljunied 2005*, pp.33-44 and *Quilty 1998*, esp. pp.60-70.

<sup>1</sup> *Raffles 1816*, p.73.

<sup>2</sup> *Kejariwal*, pp.120-121. See also *Ballantyne 2002*, pp.33-35 where he discusses the impact of “Scottish Enlightenment in ‘Further India’”.

<sup>3</sup> Spelled like this in *Raffles 1817*, Vol.II, p.7; in *Kejariwal* it is spelled ‘Barker’ (p.121). Mackenzie published his report in the 7<sup>th</sup> volume of the Transactions of the Batavian Society (*Mackenzie 1814*), whereas Baker’s “Memorandum of Antiquities of Java” apparently has been lost (*Kejariwal*, p.121).

<sup>4</sup> These were produced by the famous Daniells (uncle and nephew) who had a large experience in tropical depictions; on the practical and discursive processes involved in the production of these images, see *Forge*.

<sup>5</sup> On these examinations, the prefiguring approaches to these, and their colonial contexts in which they were set, see *Tiffin 2008* and *Tiffin 2009*.



history,<sup>1</sup> and while he made a name for himself in the *British intellectual and politicised context* through the articles he published in the *Edinburgh Review*, his first *scholarly publications* were on Javanese antiquities.<sup>2</sup> In a paper submitted to the Batavian Society and published in 1816, two published in *Asiatick Researches* in 1816, and one read before the Literary Society of Bombay in 1817 (publ. in 1820), Crawfurd dealt with the Indian influence in the region and assessed it primarily through antiquities. The paper published in the *Transact. Bat. Soc.* contained a transcription and translation of an ancient inscription in the Kawi language, whereas two of the other articles described Crawfurd's own examinations of the ruins of "Prambanan" and "Boro Bodur"; the last article in the *Asiatick researches* dealt with the existence of the Hindu religion on the island of Bali, and it was chiefly based on his "own inquiries on the island".<sup>3</sup> This article seemed to have been instrumental in establishing the image of Bali as a 'living museum', exhibiting the societal traits that Java, and other civilized parts of the archipelago, possessed before the conversion to Islam<sup>4</sup>.

On the aggregated level, all these British scholar-administrators tended to agree on both the location from whence this ancient Indian migration originated and on the period when it began. Despite some minor points of discordance, they all pointed to ancient Kalinga, or Telinga, situated roughly in between the Bengal and the Coromandel coast on the eastern coast of the Indian subcontinent, as being the main source.<sup>5</sup> The evidence offered to bolster these inferences was mainly drawn from language, etymology, and from the fact people from this region conducted an extensive trade in the Indian Archipelago, both when the Portuguese first entered these waters, and that they continued to carry it on in the present time.<sup>6</sup> However, these migrants were not merely

---

<sup>1</sup> This was an official report dealing with especially the newer history of the indigenous states of Java and based solely on Javanese written sources; as such, this report served the same function as the one described by C.D. Cowan when writing on the British Residents in the Malayan states in the late 19<sup>th</sup> C.: "Most important, this tendency was reinforced by practical considerations, officials attempting to govern by advice and to act as far as possible according to Malay [Javanese] custom, like the early Residents, needed to know what the precedents were" (Cowan, p.282). Crawfurd's report is contained in the BL Add. 30353 as well as in the Mack Private 22/3 & 85/3.

<sup>2</sup> It was not until 1816 that Crawfurd figured as a member of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal and of the Literary Society of Bombay as well (*East India Register and Directory, 1816*, p.108), whereas he had been a member of the Batavian Society since 1814 (Vol.VII of the *Transact. Bat. Soc.*); he obtained membership of the Royal Society in 1819 when back on furlough in London. (*Home*, p.324)

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1816b*, pp.128-129. Crawfurd visited Bali on a diplomatic mission; as opposed to in most other instances Crawfurd here explicitly professed his indebtedness to indigenous providers of information and discussants – especially to "the liberality of the elder Prince of Blelling" and to "some of the most intelligent Brahmens".

<sup>4</sup> See esp. *Boon 1990*, pp.37-45 (for earlier European representational modes applied on Bali, see *Boon 1976*). Raffles reiterated this approach in the appendix containing an "Account of Bali" (*Raffles 1817*, Vol.II, pp.ccxxxi-ccxl, esp. p.ccxxxv: "The present state of Bâli may be considered, therefore, as a kind of commentary on the ancient condition of the natives of Java")

<sup>5</sup> *Leyden 1811*, pp.170-172; Leyden claimed that Marsden had traced the source of influence to primarily stem "from the natives of Guzerat", something which Marsden himself explicitly denied (*Marsden 1812*, pp.xxv & xxix-xxxiii). See also HIA Vol.II, pp.226-228, and Crawfurd 1856, e.g. p.198 (entry of "Kling").

<sup>6</sup> Based on intrinsic linguistic evidence Marsden emphasized that the Sanskrit was *not solely transmitted* by traders from Telinga, but instead by a priesthood class who settled permanently in these regions; his rationale was twofold: (1) "we shall perceive that, for the most part, they not only belong to a class of ideas superior to what the transactions of a

considered to have been merchants from India who traded with Java and the other islands; on the contrary, they were settlers who migrated and created kingdoms there, most probably ruled by a priesthood class, analogous to the Brahmin caste in India,<sup>1</sup> as traced by Marsden adduced through linguistic evidence,<sup>2</sup> and as attested by the present presence of the vestiges of monuments associated with the Hindu, Buddhistic, and Jain religions.<sup>3</sup> The first arrivals of these Indians were lost in the depths of mythological time, although some weak evidence, supported by Balinese traditional accounts, could be adduced in support of dating the first establishments to the first century AD; the first Indian colony was thus “said to have arrived in the first year of their present era”: that is, that of ‘Saka’, or ‘Salivana’, which began AD 78.<sup>4</sup>

Crawfurd had, however, by 1820 abandoned all such references to information derived from native historical accounts.<sup>5</sup> In HIA Crawfurd subsumed all his researches on these matters under the heading of “Religion”, asserting that an “account of the antiquities of Java is also an account of its ancient religion, for every ancient monument on the island has been dedicated to the favourite subject of superstition, and hardly a vestige is found of any architectural remains constructed for purposes of convenience or utility.”<sup>6</sup> Instead, he now asserted that upon “such fabulous reflections”, as their own historical accounts, “we can face no confidence whatever, and our only reliance is upon the meagre and unsatisfactory notices contained in ancient inscriptions, from which a *few dates may* be ascertained, though not a single hint respecting the transactions of the country is to be

---

bazaar would require, but also, in respect to their form and pronunciation, ..., undebased by the corruptions of its provincial dialects”(p.xxv), and (2) “it must be observed that the Tamul, Telinga, and Kanari (all essentially one tongue) *are radically different from the Sankrit*, although from the abundant infusion of religious and political terms, they have not uncommonly been mistaken for its derivatives.”(p.xxxii; my italics) In this case Crawfurd seemed to concur in Marsden’s conclusion, even if reaching it from other kinds of evidence: “The question of then country of those Hindus who disseminated their religion over the Indian islands, is one of curious interest, but we should refer in vain for a solution of it to any record among the Hindus or oriental islanders [see *Marsden 1812*, p.xxiv for a similar assessment, whereas *Leyden 1811* also included “Malay history” as evidence, p.171]. *The evidence to be drawn from the examination of language is equally unsatisfactory*; notwithstanding this, the fact may be ascertained with a considerable approximation to probability. That country was Telinga, more properly Kalinga, ... Kalinga is the only country in India known to the Javanese by its proper name, - the only country familiar to them, - and the only one mentioned in their books with the exception of those current in religious legends. ... It is to Kalinga that *the Javanese universally ascribe the origin of their Hinduism*; and the more recent and authentic testimony of the Brahmins of Bali, who made me a similar assurance, ..., is still more satisfactory.” (HIA, Vol.II, pp.226-227, my italics)

<sup>1</sup> However, unlike the present presence of the caste amongst the Hindus in Bali (HIA, Vol.II, pp.237-240), Crawfurd considered it most probably absent (or only of inferior importance) in ancient Java; See both *Crawfurd 1814a* (“There is little room to believe, that the institution of casts ever prevailed among the Javanese”, p.180) and *Crawfurd 1816a*.

<sup>2</sup> *Marsden 1812*, pp.xxxi-xxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> From the onset Crawfurd identified Prambanan as a site of Hindu worship, whereas Borobudur was considered as what Crawfurd perceived to be “a temple dedicated to the Buddhist reformation of the worship of Siwa” (*Crawfurd 1817/1820*, p.163; see also *Crawfurd 1816b* & HIA, Vol.II). Crawfurd later changed his mind and tended instead to interpret Borobudur as being primarily a Jainist site (*Crawfurd 1856*, p.66, under the entry ‘Boro-Budur’). See also Ray, and Allen for an analysis of the European 19<sup>th</sup> C. ‘discovery’ and interpretations of the different strands of Buddhism.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawfurd 1816b*, p.154.

<sup>5</sup> See esp. *Crawfurd 1816b*, pp.154-158 where indigenous traditions were used to give a tentative account of the earliest history of the “Indian colonies” on Java, although it was continuously dressed in a doubt indicating discourse where in particular the term “is said to” was flourishing.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp194-195.

collected even from these.”<sup>1</sup> Upon this kind source-material, Crawfurd proceeded to provide possible dates for the construction of these grand temples – events that Crawfurd in concordance with Raffles, and partially copied from him,<sup>2</sup> ascribed to have been erected between AD 1266 and 1296 and approximately AD 1338 for the construction of Borobudur.<sup>3</sup>

Apart from prefiguring the analytical approach through an a priori establishment of the notion of an orientalist theocracy, imbuing all aspects of ancient society, and which stood in sharp contrast to the utilitarianism ingrained in Crawfurd’s own approach,<sup>4</sup> this analytical pairing of religion and antiquities also served to reify the methodological ousting of the indigenous written historical accounts from the epistemological field of the early history of Java. This ancient history was, especially by Raffles, perceived as having shaped the essential identity of the Javanese society.<sup>5</sup>

Although this establishment of a de facto British interpretive monopoly proved to be the end result of the methodological reflections and historiographical practices, it did not necessarily imply that it was the outcome of a premeditated strategy devised to disenfranchise the indigenous voices. Here Trautmann’s plea of examining what modes of knowledge the parties involved in the colonial relation brought with them becomes relevant: the tensions evinced here between the methods of antiquarianism, philosophical-, and philological history, as well as between the representational model of the historical narrative and the more structural approach of stadial theory, had their counterparts in the historiography executed both in Europe itself and applied on other non-European parts of the world.<sup>6</sup> Given the absence of written narratives produced at the same period as when the earliest events took place, a reluctance towards ascribing much weight to the much later produced native narratives was not only permissible, but indeed it was a methodologically quite sound stance: at least when other, more reliable types of source-material were procurable. And if the part of the munshi or pandit did not play such a significant role in the colonial knowledge production in the

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.298; the italics are Crawfurd’s.

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd both referred to- and discussed these findings reported in Raffles’s texts, in HIA Vol.II, pp.214-216.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp.214-215, 298-302, & in the chronological table pp.481-563 (482-484); see also Raffles’s chronological table, in *Raffles 1817*, Vol.II, pp.231-239: whereas Raffles started with the year 1 after Salivana (Ad 78) in his chronological list, Crawfurd did only commence his at the year AD 1160 (Salivana 1082, or 556 according to the Muslim Calendar). See also *Crawfurd 1816a*, pp.361-363 (the article on Borobudur did not contain any references to the year of construction), and *Crawfurd 1856*, pp.66-68 (entries of ‘Boro-Budur’ and ‘Brambanan’). These dates are substantially later than the ones normally accepted today for the constructions of these temples.

<sup>4</sup> See Part I.

<sup>5</sup> This furthermore implied that the introduction of Islam to the area, and particularly to Java in the 15<sup>th</sup> C. (HIA, Vol.II, pp.259-271) was by Raffles and Crawfurd considered to an intrusive factor, and not an essential element in Javanese culture; this again paved the way for interpreting the Muslim influence as alien and inimical to the original Javanese civilization, which the British then could claim to protect by curbing the influence of the Javanese, Muslim rulers over their own subjects. For a further discussion of this, see the next chapter on oriental despotism.

<sup>6</sup> See for instance Momigliamo’s classic article, or *Grafton* for a entertaining and very informed discussion of these tensions; in *Gascoigne 1999a* (pp.119-183), J. Bank’s formative years are interpreted as a transformations from an antiquarian to an anthropologist deeply influenced by the stadial theories on the progress of civilization.

Indian Archipelago as in it did in India during the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> C.,<sup>1</sup> then this seemed to have been because their Southeast Asian equivalents were neither as numerous, nor as integrated in the colonial power structure as in India.<sup>2</sup> Thus, even though certain ideological implications appeared to be ingrained in the discourse, this did not invariably entail that these were the product of intentional and instrumentalist inclinations.

## **2.4 Dating the History of the Malay Nation and Tracing Its Migrations.**

Apart from the inhabitants on Java,<sup>3</sup> the most important ethnic group in the Indian Archipelago were the Malays. Inhabiting vast coastal stretches throughout most of the region, and having created several important state formations, some of which exhibited a rather advanced state of civilization, the Europeans had from the very onset of their arrival to the region had contact with the Malays whose language, as stated by Marsden, constituted the *lingua franca* throughout the whole region.<sup>4</sup> To Marsden, Crawford and their contemporaries this posed two major historiographical queries: 1) how come that the *Malay language* had become so disseminated, even beyond the confines of the ‘Malay states’, as well as how was it related to the other languages existent in the region; and 2) how could these ethnically affiliated state formations scattered throughout most of the Indian Archipelago, but (almost) invariably only along the littoral, have achieved such a relatively high level of civilization that normally would be associated with large nations and not with a mere coastal people. If they were to be compared to the ancient Greek colonies along the coasts of Mediterranean- and Black Seas, then where was their original Hellas to be located? – That is, from whence did the Malays originate, when and why did they begin these migrations, and in what state of civilization were they then? The questions became even further muddled, (A) partly because the terms ‘race’, ‘nation’, and ‘civilization’ in this context often were used interchangeably, yet in some discourses they were ascribed more fixed, and quite divergent meanings,<sup>5</sup> and (B) partly because there was not absolute consensus on whether the Malay language was only a *primus inter pares* among what Marsden had defined as the Polynesian stock of languages, or whether Malay actually was the mother tongue of all these – or at least its closest survivor. Thus, in some texts the question of the origin- and migrations of the Malays tended to be conflated with the issue of who were the

---

<sup>1</sup> As argued in Bayly 1996, and also demonstrated in particularly Trautmann 2006.

<sup>2</sup> The exception was of course Raffles’s scribe Abdullah Munshi who also is known as the founder of modern Malay literature. On him and his relations to the British colonial enterprise, see e.g. Wurtzburg (many references to him scattered around in this book), Putten, Sweeney, and Krishnan.

<sup>3</sup> The main ethnic groups of which were considered to be the Javanese, inhabiting the central and eastern parts of Java, and the Sunda people occupying the western part of the island.

<sup>4</sup> Already Pigafetta had thus compiled a Malay vocabulary when the remnants of the Magellan expedition passed through these waters; see e.g. Marsden 1811, p.9 and Marsden 1812, p.iii; see also Boon 1990, pp.8-12 for a conceptual contextualization of the Pigafetta’s word list.

<sup>5</sup> Thus Crawford was by 1856 explicitly distinguishing the two issues of *nation* and *civilization* in the case of the Malays: “The origin of Malay civilization, however, is quite a distinct matter from that of the nation” (Crawford 1856, p.251).

first inhabitants in the region; given the shallow depth of the temporal framework within which most of these writers more or less explicitly operated, this tendency amongst some of these to treat the two problems as identical probably became even more enounced.<sup>1</sup>

The existence of such competing, and at times conflicting, nomenclatures did not exactly contribute to lessen these intricacies. In the discourses that derived their authority from Blumenbach and his adherents *Malay* was generic term denominating the racially defined group consisting of all the yellow complexioned, lank haired people in the region; for Marsden *Malay* referred first and foremost, but not solely, to a linguistic category; and Crawford used *Malay* as referring to both e.g. linguistic, racial, politico-historical, and civilizational-historical entities and their accompanying issues. I discuss these more in depth in Part IV by applying a diachronic perspective, and on this basis I will chart the continuities and changes in the uses and meanings of these terms and concepts.

The perhaps most glaring instance of this conflation of terminologies can probably be encountered in Prichard's introduction of the term *Malayo-Polynesian* in his "The Natural History of Man" and later reiterated in vol.5 of the third edition of his "Researches Into the Physical History of Mankind"<sup>2</sup>. Apparently appropriating it from German – most probably from F. Bopp's "Über die Verwandtschaft der *malayisch-polynesischen* Sprachen mit den indisch-europäischen" (1841) and not, as traditionally assumed, from W. von Humboldt<sup>3</sup> – Prichard used the term in a much more amorphous way than it was used in Bopp's discourse where it seemed to have been attributed a purely linguistic meaning.<sup>4</sup> However, Prichard himself referred explicitly to W. von Humboldt as the authoritative reference for his coinage of, if not the term per se, then at least the concept of Malayo-Polynesian:<sup>5</sup> "The identity, or the near affinity, of the Malays and Polynesians has been doubted, and even denied, by writers of great authority;<sup>6</sup> but it has lately been fully established through the researches of Baron William von Humboldt. I shall term these people the Malayo-Polynesian, or, in short, the Malayan race."<sup>7</sup> Prichard then applied Malayo-Polynesian in conjunction with *both* "the history of the Malayo-Polynesian Nations", "the ancient History of the Malayo-Polynesian Race", "widely dispersed Malayo-Polynesian tribes", "the history of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as it was probably most evident in *Lang*, as already discussed.

<sup>2</sup> The latter was published 1836-1847 (5 vols.; vol.5 was from 1847); the former was published for the first time in 1843 (Stocking 1973, pp.cxi-cxviii). See also Augstein 1996 and Augstein 1999.

<sup>3</sup> This interpretation has been put forward in Ross; Ross claimed that he had not encountered this term anywhere in W. von Humboldt's magnum opus.

<sup>4</sup> The scope of Bopp's text was purely linguistic, and as such not primarily invoking language as a medium to procure evidence to be used in ethnological or historical hypotheses. (Bopp 1841) See also Benes 2008, p.82.

<sup>5</sup> Ross did not appear to be aware of this (Ross); although Prichard mentioned Bopp's work in the context of Indo-European languages, he did not refer to Bopp 1841 in Prichard 1843. But Prichard 1847, Vol.V contains several references to Bopp's studies on the Malayo-Polynesian language group (pp.26-33).

<sup>6</sup> Here Prichard inserted a footnote that referred to Crawford's HIA.

<sup>7</sup> Prichard 1843, p.327.

Malayo-Polynesian *languages*”, and “Malayo-Polynesian *stock*”<sup>1</sup>. In his disquisition on the “ancient history of the Malayo-Polynesian Race” Prichard divided it into three periods within the temporally shallow framework of his manifest Biblical genealogy:<sup>2</sup> the Malayan age, or the most recent before the European discovery; the middle period, characterized by the Indian influence on especially Java; and then the earliest period, “that of the indigenous cultivation of language among the different branches of the Malayo-Polynesian race”, the most evident traces of which Prichard, on the authority of W. von Humboldt, found existent in the Tagala idiom spoken on the Philippines, and which he dubbed “the period of indigenous culture”.<sup>3</sup> As we can see, the metropolitan ethnologist Prichard invoked the same, methodologically structured periodization as Crawford and the other scholar-administrators: a remote period only approachable through presently existing linguistic features and observable racial traits, combined with stadial or genealogical theories; an ancient period primarily accessible through antiquarian researches of ruins, inscriptions, and other material vestiges of the religious systems and beliefs, and only subsidiary through indigenous traditions; and lastly a more recent period on which there existed indigenous written accounts that purportedly were of a historical nature; these chronicles narrated in particular the events associated with the Malayan migrations and their establishments of Singapura and Malacca.

However, the crucial question here was the historiographical utility of these written accounts; was it at all possible to distinguish the content that contained historical information from the mere mythological in these Malay historical romances, and what value of credibility should the alleged genuine historical content be ascribed? Or, in other words, to what extent could especially the chronology contained in the Malays’ own accounts of the events that had taken place roughly between AD 1150 (alleged establishment of the Malay settlement of Singapura) and Albuquerque’s conquest of Malacca in 1511 be entrusted. Crawford seemed from the very onset to have questioned the historical validity of the indigenous source-material referred to by Marsden in his tracing of the location of origin and the dating of the earliest migrations of the Malay *nation*, from whence the modern Malay language stemmed.<sup>4</sup> In a quote taken from Robertson’s “History of America”, but later left out of the published version of his article “The History and Languages of the Indian

---

<sup>1</sup> See Prichard 1847, vol.V, e.g. pp.3, 4, 9, 34, &186, but the instances where these are mentioned are legion.

<sup>2</sup> On the general aspects of Prichard’s chronological approach and temporal framework, Augstein 1996, pp.183-219.

<sup>3</sup> Prichard, 1847, Vol.V, pp.34-36. A similar assertion can e.g. be found in St.John 1853, vol.I, p.52.

<sup>4</sup> It should here be noted that recourse to “the authority of the native historians of the [Malay] peninsula” only played a minor part in Marsden’s discourse in as well the “Grammar of the Malayan Language” as in the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of the “History of Sumatra”, both reviewed in 1814 by Crawford in the Edinburgh Review. In the crucial parts of his argument Marsden only adduced data procured from “the Malays themselves, or their writings” as additional, supportive evidence for hypotheses that primarily dwelt upon linguistic and/or geographical evidence (see e.g. Marsden 1812a, pp.vi-vii, xi, & xxvi; Marsden 1811, p.42 & 325-345). This fact renders the keen interest in this aspect in Crawford’s discourses all the more revealing of the premises ingrained in his own approach.

Islands”, Crawford indirectly stated his rationale for discarding virtually all data contained in *the content* of indigenous texts on historical themes;<sup>1</sup> Robertson had written that:

“Like other American nations they were totally unacquainted with the art of writing & destitute of the only means by which memory of the past transactions can be prescribed with any degree of accuracy. *Even among the people to whom the use of letters is known, the era when the authenticity of History commences is much posterior to the introduction of writing.* That invention continued, everywhere, to be long subservient to the common business & wants of life, before it was employed in recording events, with a view of conveying information from one age to another.<sup>2</sup> But in no country did ever tradition alone carry down Historical knowledge, in any full continued stream”.<sup>3</sup>

Appropriating Robertson’s interpretation, Crawford transferred this general approach to his own field of study, and used it in his evaluation of the content and utility of the Malay writings on their own history, and particularly on their original homeland as well as their earliest migrations and conquests:

“With what allowances we must receive the traditions of Malay Story will appear when we reflect upon the situation of these people in the scale of society. Such among them is the infancy of the human mind, that, in matters which do not come immediately within the examination of the senses, it is often incapable of discriminating truth from fiction. Even when a Malay records the most ordinary occurrence he has a constant tendency to blend with his narrative the circumstances of the marvellous, which, with puerile simplicity, he himself implicitly credits.

---

<sup>1</sup> This touched upon the intricate question of how to ‘translate’ and subsequently evaluate non-European literary genres into an European framework of established genres, including the allegedly non-fictional one of historiography; that is, to what degree was it possible to dissociate any possible non-fictional elements narrating real events from the mere fictitious and mythological parts when it all was enshrouded in the same fabulous discourse. At least in this particular context, there does not seem to have been much appreciation of the culturally conditioned unique way of viewing the world that was ingrained in the texts produced by the natives themselves according to the conventions stipulated by their own genres – any value attributed to these texts was by all the implicated British writers only assessed by the feasibility of inscribing them into the European historiographical genre and then extracting reliable historical information from them. See *Andaya*, e.g. pp.100 & 251; for later British ways of inscribing Malaya, see *Pannu*, and *Manickam 2009a* on the ‘webs of complicity’ that arose between British colonial scholar-administrators and Malayan literati.

<sup>2</sup> In *Crawford 1819*, he had changed his fundamental interpretation of the development of literature along with the stadial progress of civilization; instead he by now claimed that: “The literature of Java, with exceptions too inconsiderable to deserve notice, *is all poetical*, or rather metrical. This is an incontestable proof of barbarism. *People write for amusement before they write for utility or instruction.* It is only when they have something of intrinsic importance to tell, that they have recourse to sober prose.” (p.404). A similar interpretation was adduced in *Crawford 1834a*, p.412. However, in both instances it was implied that historiography as a ‘realistic genre’ did only occur at a relatively late stage of civilization, whether preceded by fabulous poetry or by mundane enumerations of common business. Although acknowledging the differences between Malay historical writings and Javanese literature, this seemed to be of lesser importance here than the shift in his fundamental approach and theoretical assessment.

<sup>3</sup> Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1., p.17. My italics. Robertson wrote this while discussing “the pretensions of Peru to an high antiquity”.

A people in this state of society it may be pronounced are incapable of forming records deserving the name History, & accordingly the Malay stories are Romances undeserving of credit. All such productions are avowedly posterior to the Mahomedan invasion, tho' relating events two centuries before that passed, the narrative of which could only have been handed down thro' the imperfect medium of tradition".<sup>1</sup>

The printed article, from which these excerpts were left out, also abounded with similar assertions; that "the traditions of the Malay themselves are altogether undeserving of notice", that their "imbecility of reason and their ignorance as to matters of fact, are equally beyond the comprehension of any one accustomed only to European society", and hence "to speak of the native history of such a people, therefore, is obviously a mere mockery".<sup>2</sup> This categorical rejection of the content of the Malay historical accounts did not pass unchallenged by Crawford's peers: neither in the metropolis – as illustrated by the debate the ensued after the publication of Raffles's "History of Java" and Crawford's "History of the Indian Archipelago", and of the reviews that they wrote of each others books<sup>3</sup> – nor within the more confined circles of Europeans affiliated with the colonial administration on occupied Java.

Thus an anonymous colleague who chose the name Jambulus<sup>4</sup> as his nom de plume wrote a more than 60 pages long, privately circulated, scathing review of Crawford's article in the *Edinburgh Review*. Refuting Crawford's assessment of the absent ability of the Malay to record reliably both past and present events,<sup>5</sup> Jambulus in particular proceeded to vindicate the reliability of the Malay historical records. By stating that the "traditions regarding their early history are far less blended with the marvellous", and even "if in their attempts to account for their origin we find a mixture of mythological fable, this surely is not of itself sufficient to invalidate what may otherwise be

<sup>1</sup> Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1, pp.17-18.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1814a*, p.158.

<sup>3</sup> This debate will be examined at depth in the next chapter on oriental despotism.

<sup>4</sup> I have not been able to make a positive identification of the person who hid himself behind that name; the letter/review was dated 1<sup>st</sup> January 1815, and it seems to have been addressed to Raffles. Jambulus, or Iambulos, is the name of probably an ancient Hellenistic merchant and traveller who also is reputed to have authored the fabulous travel account "Islands of the Sun", or "The Adventures of Iambulus in the Southern Ocean", excerpts of which has survived in Diordorus Siculus's writings. Although by the 1800s recognized as what J. Stagl in another context has denominated a *fictive traveller* (rather than an outright false one) (*Stagl 1995*, p.200; see also *Adams 1980*) the travels of Jambulus were nevertheless eagerly scavenged for any credible information on the ancient Greek knowledge of the Indian Ocean; F. Wilford had, for instance, referred to him in his "An essay on the Sacred Islands of the West", recently published in the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> volumes of *Asiatick Researches* in 1810 and 1811. (On Wilford and how his Indian pandit fooled him, see *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.89-93 and *Rowly-Conwy*, pp.187-194). This seems to imply that the name of Jambulus was rather commonly known then, at least amongst people interested in orientalist knowledge. Perhaps this choice of nom de plume could be interpreted as indicating that the author, just like the original Jambulus, was a curious merchant rather than a colonial official; this seems to be corroborated by some (albeit only suggestive) internal evidence in the text (his privileging on interaction with the Malays in commercial affairs as the most authoritative source to obtain knowledge about the true nature of these people ("Now we will appeal to every eastern trader, and no men know more of the character of the Malayan character") (MSS EUR K239/5, p.134)

<sup>5</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, pp.132-142.



considered as matter of fact”,<sup>1</sup> Jambulus was both disclaiming the Crawford’s actual interpretation as well as the validity of his general approach. Drawing a direct analogy to the circumstances under which historiographies were produced in the European antiquity, Jambulus concluded that the “Malayan historians therefore stand in no worse plights in this regard than the more renowned historians of antiquity”;<sup>2</sup> this, at least in theory, would facilitate a chronology of the earliest history of the Malay nation.

Crawford repeated this stance in both his “History of the Indian Archipelago” from 1820 and in his review of Raffles’s “History of Java” published in the *Edinburgh Review* the year before. Here he stated that “to my taste it [the Malay source-material] is a most absurd and puerile production. It contains no historical fact upon which the slightest reliance can be placed; no date whatever; and if we except the faithful picture of native mind and manners which it unconsciously affords, is utterly worthless and contemptible”.<sup>3</sup> And “the carelessness and inaccurate Malays would be found incapable of accomplishing a work demanding a labour and precision, which is very adverse to the genius of their character”.<sup>4</sup> Comments with the same content were reiterated as late as in his “The Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries” in 1856.<sup>5</sup>

This sceptical assessment was stated despite the fact that these Malay historical accounts were written after the conversion to Islam, and that, according to Crawford, “The Mahometan religion brought with it, as it did in India, a more manly and sober style of thinking [compared to the exotic extravaganzas of the Hindu literature] , and since the era of conversion, we are possessed of a tolerably connected and circumstantial narrative, improving in credit and in approximation to common sense as we descend”. This was counter posed to the era “previous to the introduction of Mahometanism” where “the Javanese made no attempt to write history, and were as ignorant of chronology as the Hindus, with whom they were so intimately connected.”<sup>6</sup>

This embodied the notion that the idea of history was the conceptual prerogative of the descendants of the Judeo-Christian-Muslim civilization, and that the Hindu notion of time precluded these from possessing any real idea of chronology;<sup>7</sup> this was despite the fact that in

---

<sup>1</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, p.135.

<sup>2</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, p.141.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, vol.II, p.378n.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.51.

<sup>5</sup> “The Malays themselves, like all people in the same state of society, have no true history. The books, which have been called their annals, are, in reality, romances, and indeed so called by themselves.” (*Crawford 1856*, p.250)

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp.26-27. If we read for the rationale and assume a decent amount of consistency in Crawford’s argumentation, then the term ‘chronology’ should here probably be perceived in a narrow, historiographical context; both in *Crawford 1814a* and in HIA did Crawford emphasize the sophisticated Javanese calendar and ideas of various eras. Otherwise, this assessment of the superiority of the Malay writings over the Javanese should be perceived as a rhetorically convenient inconsistency.

<sup>7</sup> Similarly Crawford on the Javanese historiography: “From the period of the acquaintance of the Javanese with Mahomedans, forming an exact parallel case with the Hindus of India, the dawning of historical truth, and some

reality, as pointed out by Crawford himself, the Hindu heritage had on Java left its mark in the shape of the most sophisticated chronology and ancient calendar in the region. This contradictory interpretation seemed to have been the result of an insidious Indophobia, a preconceived approach that even obscured or overruled otherwise acknowledged facts. However, deeply rooted in this interpretation seemed also to be the notion of this region being perhaps was more aptly characterised by the trope of tropicality than by the orientalist one; if this was correct, then it would imply that they entered a realm deprived of history.<sup>1</sup> Crawford's HIA was, as shown by D. Arnold, instrumental in inscribing Southeast Asia into the realm of tropicality, and then attributing some of these notions to the Indian subcontinent, "by dint of geographical proximity, the continuity of scenery, climate, and vegetation, and the administrative, commercial, and scientific ties that linked them together".<sup>2</sup> Yet, this associative influence travelled in both directions: as discussed in the previous chapter on the notion of the Indian Archipelago and the competing denominations, this region constituted a contested border region between the India and the Pacific world – and as such, it could be attributed qualities of both.

Here it ought to be remembered that, although dismissing any historical value of the *content* of these Malay written sources, this did not necessarily imply they were deprived of all historical value. As an accomplished Orientalist, Crawford was not only interested in the antiquarian examinations of ancient ruins and inscriptions, but he also took a keen interest in acquiring and collecting indigenous, and particularly Javanese, manuscripts; apart from using these in his own historical writings they also provided for instance W. von Humboldt with a crucial part of the information upon which he founded his grand theories,<sup>3</sup> and these manuscripts comprised a fundamental part of the British Library's Javanese and Malay collections after they acquired the main body of his manuscripts in 1842.<sup>4</sup>

Crawford was thus neither unfamiliar with- nor uninterested in these indigenous textual productions.<sup>5</sup> As he stated in the HIA: "the work [the Malay historical text referred to] affords us but mere glimpses of true history, and is full of fable, anachronism, and discrepancy, but *deserves some consideration for the naked fidelity with which it paints the manners of the Malays at the*

---

common sense and moderation may be discovered, brightening slowly as we descend, and, from the last two centuries, improving into records of *some* consistency and moderation." (HIA, Vol.II, p.294). The italics are Crawford's.

<sup>1</sup> Arnold 2005, p.136.

<sup>2</sup> Arnold 2005, p.145.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford's manuscripts, for instance, constituted a quintessential part of W. von Humboldt's source-material on the languages spoken in this region; see esp. *Reutter*, apart from the many references in *Humboldt 1836-1839*. See Part IV for a more thorough analysis of this relationship between Crawford and Humboldt.

<sup>4</sup> See *Marrison, esp.* pp.7-10.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Carey 1978* and *Carey 1979*.

time.”<sup>1</sup> And with regard to the Javanese historiography he had earlier articulated a similar opinion: “The commencement of Javanese history or rather mythology opens a strange issue of these incongruities and absurdities, which were totally unworthy of narration; *did it not afford a striking illustration of the character of the people*, and new proof of the miserable weakness of human reason in the infancy of society.”<sup>2</sup> Although Crawford, and often in a rather cavalier manner, discarded the truth-value of these indigenous historiographical texts, he did not, however, dismiss the historiographical value of knowing the languages of region, nor the need of studying these indigenous texts; an acquaintance with these texts would thus facilitate the surest way to achieve a knowledge of the character of the people who produced these texts and of the manners of the times in which they were written.

## **2.5 The Chronology of the Modern History of the Indian Archipelago.**

With the incursion of European sails in these waters, the genres and approaches of European historiography followed in their wake. Especially the descriptions and narratives furnished by the early Portuguese travellers and chroniclers<sup>3</sup> were often referred to by the later British scholar-administrators writing on the region; with the presence of such familiar and assumedly rather trustworthy European written source-material, the focus seemed to have shifted from the question of reliance to that of relevance. What was actually worth recounting and considered of sufficient historical importance to be included in books or articles targeted towards a European audience?

In this context the tensions between the indigenous realms and the European influence appeared to produce the major historiographical queries addressed by Crawford et al; whereas the described events often were the same, and the history thus shared, the indigenous and European historiographies were rather parallel and co-existent than intertwined in these British discourses. Crawford had in 1819, as it will be discussed in the next chapter, criticised Raffles of showing far too much attention on the trifling events and cumbersome details of Javanese history such as it was contained in their own written accounts.<sup>4</sup> Yet, he was hardly more receptive towards the history of the European enterprise in the Indian Archipelago: his ideological approach – founded upon staunch free trade assumptions and the anti-monopolist doctrines of political economy – had from the beginning predisposed him towards exhibiting a sceptical view upon what he saw as the

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.51. “At the time” here refers to the date of the production of the text and not the era it purportedly described. My italics.

<sup>2</sup> BL Add. 30353, p.27. My italics.

<sup>3</sup> For more on these, see *Macgregor*.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1819*, pp.409-410.

depredations in the region committed throughout history by the Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and British conquerors and companies.<sup>1</sup>

“The Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries” from 1856 contained a comparison between the British colonization of India and the Dutch colonization of Java; under the entry on ‘Java’, Crawford concluded that: “The history of Dutch aggression in Java is probably, on the whole, neither worse or better than that of English aggression in Hindustan. Indeed, although upon very different scales, they bear, in their general features, a very close resemblance. The English administration of its conquest has, however, been at least far more fortunate than that of the Dutch.”<sup>2</sup> With this Crawford did not intend to bestow appraisal upon the Dutch colonial administration;<sup>3</sup> on the contrary, in moral terms it discursively levelled out the element of “aggression” evinced by both states in the colonial theatre, albeit the British influence had proved to be more efficient, and hence they had avoided the devastating wars that had roamed the Dutch East Indian possessions, and particularly Java, during the preceding century and in the late 1820s.<sup>4</sup> Although then primarily applying the generic, and vaguer, term *Europeans*, Crawford had nonetheless produced a similar analysis already in 1820 in HIA. When he described the history of European presence in the region, Crawford stated unequivocally that the “Europeans in the Indian Archipelago have been just what the Turks have been in Europe”,<sup>5</sup> and this had resulted in “the plunder of the east, for it does not deserve the name of commerce”.<sup>6</sup> The events produced by these European incursions did not possess an intrinsic value to the more general project undertaken in HIA, and hence they were merely attributed a subsidiary importance; they were only included because their principal aim was “to illustrate the efforts which their dominion has produced on the characters and destinies of the native inhabitants, and not to furnish a detail of *the revolting and disgusting scenes of colonial intrigue, a topic, even were it compatible with the nature of my undertaking, would little interest the greater class of readers.*”<sup>7</sup> In the end Crawford – just like Raffles and Marsden whom he had criticised for doing exactly this – accorded much more space to a delineation of the native history of the Indian Archipelago. Not out of an appreciation of the native historical achievements in the region as much as out of a depreciation of the European ditto. This critical stance should, however, not be interpreted as a reluctance towards-, or opposition of-,

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus both *Crawford 1814b*, *Crawford 1817a*, and *Crawford 1818* (all published in the Edinburgh Review) abound with examples of this view.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1856*, p.186.

<sup>3</sup> As it was illustrated by the sceptical attitude to Dutch system of forced labour (“The Cultivation System”) that was evinced by Crawford in his correspondence with the former Governor-General of the Dutch Indies (1833-1836) and Minister of the Colonies (1840-1848) J.C. Baud in 1857. This was analysed in *Bastin 1956*.

<sup>4</sup> This was written in 1856; that is, one year before the great uprising in India which became known as the Sepoy Mutiny. See also *Bayly 1986* for a contemporary analysis of these similarities and differences.

<sup>5</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.276.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.340.

<sup>7</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp.391-392; my italics.

European colonialism in the region from Crawfurd; on the contrary, a substantial part of Crawfurd's discourses in especially the 1820s and 1830s was dedicated to discussing the potentials of- and problems associated with this topic and to devising different strategies of its implantation.<sup>1</sup>

In his analysis of the differences between Crawfurd's "readiness to embark upon Toynbee-like generalizations" and the kind of historiography conducted by Horace St. John in his much more restricted quest to primarily record the "the progress of European trade and conquest in the Asiatic Archipelago"<sup>2</sup>, B. Harrison had especially emphasised the methodological and disciplinary discrepancies between the authors who, although Crawfurd by the 1850s continued to be a prolific writer, were rather emblematic for each their epoch.<sup>3</sup> Both historiographically and ideologically. St. John was thus, as pointed out by Harrison, much more careful than Crawfurd in acknowledging his sources, and numerous footnotes adorned almost every page of his text. Just as interesting seem, however, the divergent ways in which these two weighted the parts of the native- and the European *history*<sup>4</sup> in the Indian Archipelago; and more particularly the space allotted to the history of region before AD c.1500. H. St John's "The Indian Archipelago: Its History and Present State" from 1853 thus disposed of the period before AD 1500 in a mere 50 pages, or less than a tenth of the part explicitly dedicated to the historical disquisition in the book,<sup>5</sup> before turning to the narrative of the progression of the inevitable and irreversible process of the European subduing of the native states. St. John's narrative was one of continuity and progress, beginning with the Portuguese and ending with the British; hence it was quite unlike Crawfurd's narrative in which his plans for a future British colonial project were placed within the chapters on political economy, rather than within the historical framework; something which also implied a discursive dissociation of the British invasion of Java 1811-1816 from the earlier history of the European powers in the region.<sup>6</sup> In St. John's progressionist narrative even the influence of the Dutch in the region was represented in positive rather than in a pejorative light, despite instances of cruelty and monopolistic despotism: "posterity

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bastin 1953, Quilty 2001, Knapmann2006, Knapman 2007, and Knapman 2008a.

<sup>2</sup> *St. John*, vol.I, pv, and pp.ix-x for similar assertions. H. St. John was son of the famous journalist and radical James Augustus St. John; early in his life he was introduced to his father's trade. As journalist Horace St. John was attached to inter alia Daily Telegraph and Times, while he besides "The Indian Archipelago" also authored "History of the British Conquests in India" (2 vols., 1852) (ODNB; Barker & Prior). Among Horace's brothers in the service of Brooke in Sarawak there was to be counted both James St. John and the more well-known Spenser St. John, who later wrote a biography on Brooke (*Brooke 1879/1994*), as well as contributing to the "Journal of the Indian Archipelago" with many articles.

<sup>3</sup> *Harrison*; for St. John, see esp. pp.252-254.

<sup>4</sup> And not the *historiography*, as I discussed earlier in this chapter.

<sup>5</sup> The major part of Vol.II was dedicated to a discussion of the contemporarily much debated topics of the seemingly endemic piracy in the region and the position of Sir James Brooke's Rajahship of Sarawak; given the involvement of the St. John family in Brooke's enterprise, and the positive light in which this was assessed in Horace St. John's book, this can be seen as much as a politically motivated plaidoyer for Brooke in the contemporary debate as a historical work on the Indian Archipelago in its own right. (see e.g. *Irwin 1955*, pp.142-143; *Tarling 1963*; *Tarling 1982*; *Ingleston; Walker*; and *Middleton*, p.394. R.H.W. Reece on the contrary emphasized that the more unflattering aspects of Brooke also depicted in *St. John 1853* (In *Reece 1994*, p.viii))

<sup>6</sup> See Part I.

will never look back with less admiration on the efforts of Holland, because she contemplated an empire in the East. It has been a dream with every nation, and an honourable ambition has urged them to secure it.”<sup>1</sup> So, if the Dutch had been the harbingers of civilization in the region, then the British epitomized this progressive power, “a power which the historian, without being influenced by national partiality, may describe as the only one which has not signalised its progress by acts of oppression and cruelty. This was England.”<sup>2</sup>

This was reflected in the categorical dismissal of any notion of Asiatic history; thence the pre-European period was characterised in the following manner by St. John:

”To follow the course of events from the foundation of Malacca until the appearance of a European sail in these waters, would lead through *an intricate labyrinth of uninteresting details*. Conquests, dethronements, restorations, petty wars, and ceaseless oppression of the people, such are the *universal features of purely Asiatic history*; a confused and barren series of transactions, less meriting than, to borrow a phrase from Milton, the skirmishes of kites and crows. They teach few lessons, because they belong to a system altogether distinct from *our civilization*. All we learn from them is the nature of barbarism.”<sup>3</sup>

The labyrinth metaphor seemed to characterize St. John’s interpretation of the history of the region and of his general historiographical approach aptly; before the advent of the Europeans, this region was lost in oriental inertia, and only with the Europeans did they enter the realms of progressive history. The “nature of barbarism” appeared to have been deprived of any vestige of the dynamism discussed in Crawford et al’s use of the theories of stadial progression of civilization, and hence it lay beyond the scope of history. To St. John, the progress of history was no longer universal as much as it was European: rather than merely representing the highest level of civilization, Europe by now incarnated this. And as stated by H. White, that “just as every ideology is attended by a specific idea of history and its process, so too, I maintain, is every idea of history attended by specifically determinable ideological implications.”<sup>4</sup> Although a British colonisation of the Indian Archipelago appeared as the ultimate end for both Crawford and St. John, the discursive frameworks into which this end was inscribed differed on the fundamental levels, and where Crawford treated it as a heatedly debated political topic, it was presented as the ineluctable outcome by St. John who stated that: “Indeed, it is not easy to disbelieve, and it is ridiculous to deride the

<sup>1</sup> *St. John*, vol.I, p.262.

<sup>2</sup> *St. John*, vol.I, p.201. See also p.274 in that volume for a very manifest articulation of Great Britain’s global, colonial mission.

<sup>3</sup> “St. John”, p.43; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> *White 1973*, p.24. Or, as stated elsewhere: “The issue of ideology points to the fact that there is no value-neutral mode of emplotment, explanation, or even description of any field of events, whether imaginary or real, and suggests that the very use of language itself implies or entails a specific posture before the world which is ethical, ideological, or more generally political: not only all interpretation, but also all language is politically contaminated.” (*Fictions of Factual Representation*, in *White 1978*, p.129)

theory, that it is the destiny of the West to spread its dominion over the East, through the length and breadth of Asia. I put faith in the fortunes of Great Britain, which may lead her to possess, if not the whole, at least most of that region which she has proved herself, of all others, the most capable to rule.”<sup>1</sup>

## **2.6 Conclusion.**

Spatially, the region oscillated between being perceived as an integrated part of Asia or as constituting an autonomous zone, either with or without the isles of the Pacific and Australia. Among the defining criteria applied in this process, linguistic affiliation played from the very onset a primary, but not solitary, part; the composition of physical geography and the assessment of the various races inhabiting the region were also important. Especially the definition and mapping of the latter played a pivotal part in establishing the inner as well as the outer boundaries of the region; these were assumed to reflect either different stages- or zones of civilization, to indicate the routes of migration in the earliest and otherwise undocumented parts of history, or, for the polygenists, to demarcate the various zones where man was created. Throughout the whole period, there was a certain continuity in the framing of the fundamental queries regarding the essence, extension, and affiliations of this region tugged in between Asia and the Pacific; however, the value attributed to the different methodological approaches applied to assess these questions varied, and this was accompanied by changes in the assumed premises as well in the larger interpretive frameworks and theories into which the evidence adduced from these approaches were inscribed.

The same can be said of the chronological framing. There existed a wide consensus on the chronological periodization of the main eras in the area – from the earliest, unrecorded times up to the present colonial regimes; this periodization rested mostly on methodological criteria. Thus, the origins and dissemination of the earliest people in the region had to be embedded within the realms of conjectural history and/or ethnology, and it was through the medium of language (or, subsidiary, biological race) that the main portion of evidence was procured. The Hindu and Buddhist influences from the Indian subcontinent were domesticated into a well known orientalist domain, and here antiquarianism provided the evidence, supported by philology and ideas grounded in the studies on comparative religion. The origin and spread of the Malay nation and/or civilization was assessed through especially language and manuscript-based philology, and they were interpreted within a genealogical- or stadial ethnological framework, or they were integrated in a straightforward historical narrative. The chronology of the newest history was based on written sources of either indigenous or European provenance. Yet the importance and relevance allotted to each of these eras varied widely; the differences in the assessments of the possibilities and potential offered by the

---

<sup>1</sup> *St. John*, Vol.I, p.274.

available source-material undoubtedly influenced these evaluations, and when inscribed into discrepant interpretive and structural frameworks this resulted in very divergent syntheses of the past and present state of the region.

Hence, although these geographical and chronological notions may not have had much direct influence upon the colonial enterprise, its ideological underpinning, or the actual policy making involved herein, they nevertheless carved out an adequate analytical space which prefigured the interpretive scope of the historians and ethnologists who wrote on this region. This again affected the ideas regarding the possibility for- and potential of the region in terms of how the civilization and history of the societies inhabiting the region were perceived and conceptualized.



### 3. Observing, Documenting, and Interpreting Oriental Despotism in Crawford's Travelogues.

Halfway through an article entitled "Publications respecting the Eastern Peninsula of India"<sup>1</sup>, and which was published in the *Edinburgh Review* in January 1814, the author found himself musing on the different manners in which travellers could convey their knowledge of distant countries in the most adequate and illuminating way.

"There are two modes of communicating the observation of a traveller. One is by *narrative and description*, in which *we are carried along with the writer*, introduced to the persons with whom he converses, observe the scenes which he visits, and hear his observations upon every subject as it occurs. Another is, that by *systematic or classified statement*, in which that author, leaving the character of a traveller, becomes a *collector of statistical facts under general heads*".<sup>2</sup>

The author of this article seems to be John Crawford who in 1814 occupied the post as Resident at the Court at Yogyakarta in central Java.<sup>3</sup>

After having distinguished between these two fundamentally different modes of representation, the author assessed the advantages as well as the less attractive characteristics associated with each of them: "On the subject of countries which have been amply explored, with regard to which we abound in works of detail, and of the most minute particulars have been described again and again, the latter mode may be preferable." However, "even in this case, it is desirable to have the observations of the eyewitness in their first, original colours". Ironically, at least when considering the structure in Crawford's later books, he then stated that "the work of generalization may be performed, and generally better performed, by one *who has not had the opportunity of observing*".<sup>4</sup> In summing up the evidence of a variety of witnesses, entire impartiality is indispensable, and a man's own observations are extremely apt to give a bias to the judgement".

This distinction between description and classification of the one hand and an individual-orientated, diachronically progressive narration on the other was by no means new; it relied upon a well established tradition within both European travel literature and the theorizing upon this.<sup>5</sup> Travellers faced the same problems as historians: viz. how could they convince their readers of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The article also included a review of the third edition of Marsden's *History of Sumatra* published in 1811.

<sup>2</sup> Both this and all the following quotations are from *Crawford 1814a*, p.349; the italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> See *Carey 2008*, p.809 for a list of the Residents in Yogyakarta.

<sup>4</sup> This assertion echoed James Mill's rejection of the necessity of local knowledge in writing the systemised history of India and the notorious dictum stated in his *History of British India* that "as soon as every thing of importance is expressed in writing, a man who is duly qualified may obtain more knowledge of India in one year in his closet in England, than he could obtain during the course of the longest life, by the use of his eyes and ears in India" (Quoted in *Trautmann 1997/2004*, p.119).

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Stagl 1995* and *Stagl 1996*.

veracity of their written statements regarding places and events which were so far removed in either time or space that they could not be checked and thus validated in any possible way by the readers themselves. Hence the credibility of any such account relied on the authority vested in the author and his (or hers) ability to produce a discourse that appeared to provide the most authentic account of the place and/or events in question.<sup>1</sup> This is what D.N. Livingstone has called the need “to bridge the cognitive gap between presence and absence”.<sup>2</sup>

The 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries had been rife with travel fiction, fictional travellers, forged travel accounts, as well as subtle intermediaries between these forms,<sup>3</sup> and this had imbued the reading public with a *prima facie* distrust in the credibility of the genre of travel literature, if not in the individual travel account *per se*.<sup>4</sup> In principle, this seemed to be the case no matter whether it was framed in the form of a diachronic narrative or in the shape of a “systematic or classified statement” that often included the word *history* in its title.

However, it appeared that around the year 1800 the tide of mistrust had been partially reversed, and the need to stress the credibility of one’s text was not so imminent – at least not if the author belonged to the group of *gentlemen*, such as those employed in the service of the east India Company, like Crawford or Stamford Raffles.<sup>5</sup> Yet this did not imply that the question of authority was absent, or that it was not considered important: as we will discover later, the issue of the socially infused credibility could certainly arise when the scientific opinions and assertive egos of two gentlemen, sharing roughly the same social trustworthiness, clashed. As in the case of Crawford and Raffles who did so on several occasions – including on the contended question of the presence of Oriental despotism in the recently British occupied areas of Southeast Asia, as well as its probable origins- and political implications.

---

<sup>1</sup> Much has been written on this topic during the last three decades or so – for a systematic analysis of the many faces of the “truth/lie” dichotomy and the interplay between fact and fiction in travel literature see Adams 1983; Clifford 1983 dealt more specifically with this topic in the context of the anthropological methods and what went before these became rigidified in a scientific discipline, whereas an erudite and informed account of the continuities and changes in the “authority problem” within the discipline of history can be found in Grafton 1997 (see esp. pp.204-06); S. Shapin addressed the intersections between the social- and discursive credibility strategies employed by both scientists and travellers in an English 17<sup>th</sup> century context. (Shapin 1994, see esp. ch.3 & 6).

<sup>2</sup> Livingstone 2003, p.147.

<sup>3</sup> Adams 1980 provided a presentation and analysis of a number of the most illustrious cases of how “authentic travel accounts that in an Age of Reason told untruths” and “pseudo voyages that were designed to make the public believe them real” (p.vii); ch.4 of Stagl 1995 has an analysis of the Psalmanazar case, a notorious cause célèbre of the 18<sup>th</sup> century; J. Lamb has examined these topics in the context of the suspicion with which the travel accounts from the Pacific, that “great ocean of fantasy”, were received by their readers (Lamb, pp.201-12).

<sup>4</sup> This general mistrust was to some degree self-inflicted since the travel writer’s truth claim was often based on the assertion that, whereas earlier travellers had lied or exaggerated, the author in question was actually the first to tell the truth. (see e.g. Adams 1983, p.97)

<sup>5</sup> For an exactly opposite interpretation, see Carhart; here it was asserted that: “in this very moment [the late 18<sup>th</sup> century], when travel literature became closely allied with natural history, *the problems of uncertainty and disbelief actually became worse*” (p.64; my italics). I discuss this issue later in this chapter.

In the following I will analyse the different modes in which the notion of *Oriental despotism* was conceptualized, articulated, and contextualized in John Crawford's writings up to 1830. Special attention will be paid to the authority ascribed to the *observation* as an allegedly simple act of authentication in his two travelogues, and to how these observations were by no means as simple and obvious as presented; rather, they appear to have been entangled within an intricate set of epistemological procedures and discursive practices.<sup>1</sup> In order to locate the travel literature within the larger matrix of the production and reception of knowledge on Southeast Asia, its societies, and their history, I will also examine the intertwined relationship between travel literature and other *genres*<sup>2</sup> through which this idea of Oriental despotism was articulated; these will here mainly, but not exclusively, be represented by a set Crawford's writings on this topic within various genres.

The following presentation of Crawford's ideas on Oriental despotism and their contemporary reception will integrate both what B.S. Cohn has termed *investigative modalities*, and what in C. Bayly's "Empire and Information" can be read as an expounding of different *levels of knowledge*. It can, *mutatis mutandis*, be argued that whereas Cohn focussed primarily on the *epistemological* dimension of the colonial discourses, Bayly on the other hand showed more attention towards the *instrumentalist* uses of these discourses.<sup>3</sup> By integrating both of these aspects, I here aim at analysing 1) the instances when the trope of Oriental despotism was constitutive and prefigured the ways in which the Asian societies were approached, conceptualized, observed (including what was not deemed pertinent and thus remained unobserved), and later described, as well as 2) being aware of the moments when the idea of Oriental despotism was evoked as a deliberate part of a political rhetoric serving a calculated agenda.

In the following, I will first provide a brief sketch of the historical setting and the various contexts in which the idea of Oriental despotism was invoked in the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, before turning my attention to some of the more curious ways of actually observing the presence of Oriental despotism in Siam (Thailand), Cochin China (part of Vietnam), and Ava (part of

---

<sup>1</sup> I thus concur fully with D.N. Livingstone's assertion that within travel literature "any seeming experiential spontaneity was as much the outcome of editorial fashioning and rhetorical flourish as of direct empirical description." (*Livingstone 2003*, pp.146-147)

<sup>2</sup> The term *genre* should here be interpreted in its loosest, non-essentialist, non-presentist, and non-specialized meaning: i.e. as just referring to a loosely-knit set of texts that in the past social world was considered as possessing some common features in their form and/or content, and these texts were thus perceived as having similar qualities and hence subjected to roughly the same standards in terms of reception and evaluation. And probably this influenced their production too, both in terms of what to include and what to exclude from the published text as well as how to present the content. For a thoughtful discussion of the problems associated with the concept of *genre* in intellectual- and cultural history, see *Adams 1983*, esp. ch.1.

<sup>3</sup> As such these two discrepant aspects were respectively emphasised by M. Foucault in his notion of *discourse* and by A. Gramsci in his ideas on *discursive hegemony*. Despite the obvious discrepancies, and perhaps even the incommensurability, between these two approaches, I nonetheless think that an attention towards both of the fields delineated by these concepts can be observed without any undue eclecticism, as long as their diverging epistemological preconditions and implications are respected.

Burma/Myanmar). Then Crawford's more abstract speculations on the ancient origins of Oriental despotism in Southeast Asia will be analysed and compared to the ideas held by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, in this context his adversary. This is followed by a discussion of the paradigmatic and argumentative discrepancies between Crawford's and Raffles's discourses on Oriental despotism, and here I will be particularly attentive to the different authority claims invoked by both. Before that, however, I have looked at how Crawford as a colonial administrator in his unpublished reports attributed a more recent origin of Oriental despotism on Java. Lastly I examine how he, in the capacity as a diplomat, used the notion of Oriental despotism as part of his negotiations, or retrospectively as legitimating why the objectives of the diplomatic missions were not met.

Thus, by comparing the heterogeneous ways in which Oriental despotism was conceptualised and represented by Crawford as a learned traveller, philosophical historian, scholar-administrator, and diplomat, I will endeavour to locate the knowledge production engendered within Crawford's travelogues in their broader colonial, cultural, political, and epistemological framework.

### **3.1 Historical Context: Oriental Despotism and the Mode of Governance in India and Southeast Asia.**

The question of whether European and Asian societies were fundamentally alike or exhibited radical differences in both their appearances and essences has occupied European thought since the ancient Greeks first coined the distinction between the two neighbouring continents. It was, however, Aristotle's distinction between "mere" tyranny, the perverted form of monarchy,<sup>1</sup> and a more institutionalised despotism that paved the way for locating despotism firmly in an Oriental realm. In contrast to tyranny, despotism constituted "an established system of arbitrary rule, legal insofar as laws do exist, [and] often accepted by the people at large as legitimate".<sup>2</sup> Allegedly, this was especially prone to happen in the Oriental realm, and the causes of were often explained by the influence of climate or other environmental factors.<sup>3</sup>

In time Oriental despotism came to be identified by a set of fixed images, or *topoi*, which were widely shared by the literate European community; these prescribed how such a despotic governed, Oriental society would look and be like.<sup>4</sup> These *topoi* were not only considered valid for the Middle East; this Orient also stretched to India, where, as part of a larger discourse, "the trope of "the Orient" in early nineteenth-century India tended to look westward and so to align India with Persia

---

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle discussed the concept of 'tyranny' in his *Politics* (esp. 1295a20-23). This distinction was resuscitated in the Renaissance as a guiding trope in assessing Asian societies as an alternative to the religiously based Christian-Muslim binary. (Goody, p.100)

<sup>2</sup> Pp.115-116 in *Rubiés*.

<sup>3</sup> *Rubiés*, p.116, and *Irwin 2008*, p.17. For a general survey, see also *Koebner*, pp.275-302.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Pocock's discussion of Gibbon's use of these specific Oriental traits, in *Pocock 2005*, p.23.

and the Muslim Middle East.”<sup>1</sup> And although the trope of the Orient was never the only one applied in the authoritative descriptions India, the notion of an archetypical mode of Oriental despotism nevertheless seemed to have pervaded, even when it was transplanted to other discourses.

Although I certainly agree with J. Goody’s assessment that “the whole idea of Asian despotism is grossly inadequate”, and “that a binary opposition between Europe and despotic Asia is hasty and founded on ignorance or prejudice”,<sup>2</sup> I nevertheless contend that, as a concept and as a guiding trope, it has throughout history exerted a profound influence upon the European approaches to the Asian space and the societies inhabiting it. And I suppose that Goody would agree with in that; indeed, the continued presence of this profound influence in much western historiography seemed to constitute the very *raison d’être* for Goody’s analysis.<sup>3</sup> “The notion of Asiatic despotism is revealed as a way that Europe denied those states legitimacy, first in Ancient Greece and subsequently in the scholarship of post-Renaissance times. It is a concept that needs to be abandoned.”<sup>4</sup> But for centuries it was crucial to the European – and in *casu* British and more particularly Crawford’s – prefigured and undoubtedly prejudiced ways of approaching, analysing, and assessing the Asian societies; it is the epistemological preconditions, intellectual contexts, and ideological implications of this that I have set out to examine here.<sup>5</sup>

In general, ‘Oriental despotism’ was characterized by the following topoi: 1) an *arbitrary* government solely subjected to the whims of the ruler – that is, an absence of a constitution and of a systematic judicial practice, and this often was exemplified in cruel and arbitrary punishments; 2) this also meant that there was no established rule determining the succession of power, and this entailed an endemic risk for strife and civil war; 3) when the power of the ruler was truly absolute, without any exceptions whatsoever, any existence of a *class of nobility* was purely nominal – they did not constitute a check on the power of the ruler, but on the contrary were absolutely dependent on him; 4) all property ultimately belonged to the ruler since there was no laws that stated otherwise, and thus the ruler could do what he liked – including appropriating all property.<sup>6</sup> In short, this implied that private property, if existent, rested solely at the mercy of the ruler, and thence it did not exist as a concept at all.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Arnold 2005, p.121.

<sup>2</sup> Goody, p.102.

<sup>3</sup> See Goody, pp.99-122. Although Goody’s analysis was primarily targeted at the descriptions and evaluations of the Ottoman society, most of the analysed traits were, nonetheless, assumed to be applicable to most of the Asian societies; Goody’s analysis centred on the ways of assessing the political systems (‘democracy vs. despotism’), the mode of land tenure and property rights (an absence of feudalism in Asia), and the legal systems (Roman Law vs. arbitrary rule).

<sup>4</sup> Goody, p.118.

<sup>5</sup> As J.M. Hobson has analysed in the case of 19<sup>th</sup> C. British imperialism and its *free market* theories; for the importance of the trope of Oriental despotism in these discourse, see esp.61. (in Hobson 2006)

<sup>6</sup> Whether there actually existed any traditional norms that stated otherwise was a widely discussed theme in Europe then. I will, however, not specifically address this interesting topic here.

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. Whelan.

The concept of ‘Oriental despotism’ was, as J.P. Rubiés has shown, intended both as an adequate description of the societies encountered in the Orient, as well as it was directed towards a European subject area: the descriptions of the despotic Orient invariably contained more or less veiled allusions to the problem of absolutism in Europe.<sup>1</sup> In this way the travel accounts of the Orient provided the European philosophers with argumentative ammunition with which they could assail European absolutism indirectly in the shape of Oriental despotism, or assert it as being essentially different from the Oriental despotism.<sup>2</sup> Being applied as a rhetorical device in a European setting obviously distorted somewhat the picture of the East as depicted through Oriental despotism.<sup>3</sup>

This idea of an essentially despotically ruled Orient or Asia was “reintroduced” to the Asian realm by the Europeans, when the British at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century saw themselves faced with the challenge of governing substantial parts of the Indian subcontinent: should these provinces be governed according to European principles, to their original customs and laws, or somewhere in between?<sup>4</sup> In any case, it called for further study on these indigenous customs and laws; only by discovering, or inventing, such a corpus of customs and laws could an efficient and viable governmental strategy be devised. A. Dow’s “History of Hindostan” from 1772 represented one of the first attempts to do this. “Appealing to the idea of *legal, non-arbitrary despotism*, they sought to rule India according to native custom by restoring the elements of order and moderation (including traditional rights to property) implicit in the ancient legal systems, suitably clarified.”<sup>5</sup>

In modern Indian historiography the question of Oriental despotism has hence often been relocated from a question of *essential* Asiatic modes of government to a discussion “on the exercise of despotic power in Asia – by the British, not by ‘Oriental despots’”.<sup>6</sup> In devising this instrumental version of Oriental despotism a number of prominent Scottish civil servants and army officers participated; among these were people like Munro, Malcolm, and Elphinstone. And, one might add, John Crawford. These people were educated in the Scottish system, ardent readers of the Scottish conjectural historians, and they intended to build their “quasi-despotic” strategies of government on

---

<sup>1</sup> Rubiés; on the theoretical approaches as part of the ongoing debate on Orientalism, see esp. pp.109-115; on Bernier and other *philosophical travellers*, see p.136-158; and on the reception of their travel accounts among the Enlightenment philosophers, see pp.158-180.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Whelan, pp.642-646 and Rubiés, pp. 158-169.

<sup>3</sup> As Rubiés stresses one should be careful not to exaggerate the element of pure European constructivism involved in the trope of ‘Oriental despotism’ on the basis of an unsubstantiated “Saidian” approach; recent research seems to suggest that contemporary Asiatic descriptions of the Asian mode of government actually employed many of the same traits as those ingrained in the trope of ‘Oriental despotism’. (Rubiés, pp.109-115 & 177-180).

<sup>4</sup> B.S. Cohn’s essay “Law and the Colonial State in India” treated this subject from the point of view of the problems encountered by the British lawmakers in devising an adequate jurisprudence for India in late 18<sup>th</sup> century, see Cohn, 1996, esp. pp.62-63. See also Rubiés, pp.169-174 and Whelan.

<sup>5</sup> Rubiés, p.173, my italics. For more on Dow, see also Trautmann 1997/2004, e.g. pp.71-72.

<sup>6</sup> P.469 in McLaren 1993.

the foundation of the framework of a progressive stadial theory and conjectural history.<sup>1</sup> The purpose with this political strategy was the advancement of the “progress of civilization” as advanced by this illiberal strategy of liberal imperialism; by incorporating Indians into the administrative and judicial structures they, in theory, intended to educate them to be able one day to govern themselves along “modern” principles.<sup>2</sup> The problem was obviously to agree on when that day had arrived; and when western-educated Indians from the 1830s actually began to claim their rightful place within this system, these continued to be marginalised, but now on much more overtly racial grounds, as e.g. T. Koditschek recently has argued.<sup>3</sup>

After having returned to Great Britain and been engaged as the paid agent for the private Calcutta and Straits Settlements merchants, Crawford became an indeed very ardent spokesman against the EIC adopting an Oriental despotism as the preferred mode of governance. Especially when formulated as an instance of a “despotic officialism” that negated the fundamental rights of the white non-EIC settlers in the region, and which, according to Crawford, actually arrested rather than abetted the progress of its native subjects.<sup>4</sup>

### **3.2 Observing Oriental Despotism: Morphology of a Travelling Gaze.**

The Embassy sent by the East India Company to the Courts of Siam and Cochin China in 1821-1822, and with Crawford as the head of the diplomatic entourage, had as its explicit instructions “to endeavour to remove every unfavourable impression which may exist as to the views, or principles, of the Honourable Company and the British nation, in seeking a renewed connexion solely for the purposes of trade”.<sup>5</sup> Apart from the immediate goals of negotiating a treaty on trade and ‘showing the flag’, information gathering composed an important part of the project too, since “these countries are all imperfectly known, and *a knowledge of their social condition and commercial resources* is intimately connected with the great object which the Government have in view by your mission – the extension of commercial relations of the nation in general, and more particularly of its Asiatic possessions”.<sup>6</sup> Crawford had been chosen for this assignment partly due to his skills as a

---

<sup>1</sup> See esp. McLaren 2001, chapter 1. For a more general introduction to the ways in which Asian history and present times were inscribed in these theories, see Marshall & Williams, pp.128-151.

<sup>2</sup> See McLaren 1993, pp.491-494 and McLaren 2001, esp. pp.160-239. Focussing on a Southeast Asian setting, Knapman argued that during the 19<sup>th</sup> century British Imperialism, without necessarily being aware of it, was structured on a “notion of civil society and, by implication, the natural rights of civil society to develop along a civilizational trajectory, a belief in [eventual] self-determination was built into the logic of the British Empire.” (Knapman 2006, p.20) For a more thorough analysis of this argument, see Knapman 2007.

<sup>3</sup> See Koditschek 2011, esp. chapter 2.

<sup>4</sup> On these aspects, see esp. Stokes, and especially Quilty 2001, which contained the hitherto by far most detailed analysis of these aspects of Crawford’s discourses.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.590. Contained in Appendix B: “Instructions. To John Crawford, ESQ, Agent to the Governor-General, on a Mission to the Eastward”, as point 5.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford, 1828a, p.593. Contained in Appendix B: “Instructions. To John Crawford, ESQ, Agent to the Governor-General, on a Mission to the Eastward”, as point 19. (my italics)

diplomat and partly because of “his intimate acquaintance with the manners, customs and commerce of the Eastern Archipelago, and the high reputation for ability, judgement and discretion, which he had so deservedly acquired”.<sup>1</sup> What was needed was thus not only an experienced diplomat and an acute observer, but also a person who could turn the information obtained through observation as well as through other media into a systemized and useful knowledge, upon which a sort of ideology, or political rationale, could be framed; this could subsequently serve as a launching pad for the more specific political strategies on how Great Britain should act in these regions. Crawford had already proven himself capable of producing such an interpretive framework in his written reports from Java<sup>2</sup> and not at least through the publication of HIA the year before; this work should not only be perceived as expression of Crawford’s scientific zeal, but it also formed an integrated part of a well-proven “career-building technique”.<sup>3</sup>

Although the direct diplomatic results of the mission were quite meagre,<sup>4</sup> a twentieth century historian still described it as being “of considerable historical significance”, and the account Crawford produced was widely circulated within the East India Company even before its publication in 1828.<sup>5</sup> Certainly, it did not impede the East India Company from putting him in charge of another difficult diplomatic mission to the Kingdom of Ava in 1826; Crawford was here equipped with a wide margin to act according to his own judgement.<sup>6</sup> Crawford had immediately before occupied the position as civil Commissioner of the newly conquered Pegu, and before then he had been ‘Resident’ of Singapore, 1823-1826.<sup>7</sup> The Embassy to the capital was supposed to settle a Trade Agreement between the British governed parts of India<sup>8</sup> and the Burmese Kingdom, as stipulated in the Treaty of Yandabo in 1826<sup>9</sup> that ended the First Anglo-Burmese War.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from General-Governor, the Marquis of Hastings to “The Court of Directors”, Nov. 23, 1821. Reprinted in *The Crawford Papers*, pp.1-12. (Quotation from p.7)

<sup>2</sup> Contained in Add. 30,353.

<sup>3</sup> McLaren, 2001, p.3. Such career-building techniques were especially applied by the relatively well educated Scotsmen in order to compensate for a lack in the social connections that otherwise could secure a high rank in the British society in general and also within the East India Company.

<sup>4</sup> In Raffles’ words: “This mission it is well known was not attended with the success expected; little or no positive advantage was gained to our trade, but the foundation of a friendly intercourse was laid by our visit, and the knowledge procured may prepare the way for a future attempt under more favourable circumstances”. (*Raffles 1826*, p.vii)

<sup>5</sup> Wyatt 1966, pp.iii-iv. See also Wyatt 1988, pp.v-xi, and Fulford. & Kitson, pp.xiii-xiv & p.169.

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1829a*, Appendix No.1 “Envoy’s Public Instructions”, from G. Swinton, Secretary to the [Indian] Government to J. Crawford. Appendix pagination, pp.1-7; see especially point 3, p.1. see also Banerjee, pp.369-372.

<sup>7</sup> See Turnbull’s article on Crawford in ODNB, and *Crawford, 1829a*, e.g. p.409.

<sup>8</sup> Both the Embassy to Siam and Cochin China and this Embassy were sent out by the general-Governor of India, and not by the King of Great Britain; this gave rise to several complications.

<sup>9</sup> *Crawford, 1829a*, Appendix No.3 provides us with a synoptic presentation of the English version of this treaty and a translation of the Burmese version – see Appendix pagination, pp.20-24.

<sup>10</sup> Crawford’s published journal generally confirms Bayly’s tracing of the relative failure of the British in Burma to the fact that: “The lack of mutual understanding between the two governments was apparent at all levels throughout the conflict”; the leaders of the Burmese society strove tenaciously to keep it hermetically closed to outsiders, and it was absolutely detached from the ‘information order’ of the Indian subcontinent. (Bayly, 1996, p.114 & 126-127)



### 3.2.1 Crawford as a Writer of Travelogues.

Whereas HIA was solely structured by its “systematic or classified statement”, and had the individual character of the traveller virtually written out of the text, Crawford’s two travel accounts, published in 1828 and 1829 respectively, tried to integrate both of the representational strategies mentioned in the beginning of this paper. These travelogues were based on the experiences gained during his diplomatic missions to Siam & Cochin China in 1821-1822 and to Ava in 1826-1827.<sup>1</sup>

In all important aspects these two books were structured in the same manner. Ordered chronologically and kept in a first-person narrative, approximately the first half of the books was presented as if it composed by the crude, unedited journal kept on a day to day basis by Crawford.<sup>2</sup> This was a quite ordinary strategy in claiming authenticity by presenting an apparently unmediated picture of the ‘raw facts’ without any literary adornments.<sup>3</sup> Plenty internal evidence, however, can be found which reveal that the published journal extracts did not convey such a direct and unedited impression as indicated. For instance, in his “Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Court of Ava”, all the diplomatic negotiations are presented as ongoing dialogues, as if it recreated the negotiations exactly as they had been;<sup>4</sup> yet Crawford later admitted that these dialogues of ‘direct speech’ did only display “the substance of it [i.e. the negotiation]”,<sup>5</sup> and hence it must to a certain degree already have undergone a process of interpretation in order to extract the substance from the mere incidental. The most conclusive evidence of the subsequent processing of this allegedly “raw” journal, however, can be adduced through an examination of the distributional ratio between the narrative and the descriptive parts contained in this, allegedly, day-to-day journal. A brief narrative introduction was in both books usually followed by much longer descriptions of

---

<sup>1</sup> The aspects of the reception of these books have not been studied yet. But both books went through a second edition, *The Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Courts of Siam and Cochin China* in 1830 and the *Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Court of Ava* in 1834; both 2<sup>nd</sup> editions were in 2 volumes instead of one, and they were furthermore in the less expensive octavo format, compared to the original quarto; the illustrations seem to have been reprinted in an unaltered state. In 1831 a German edition of the “Journal ... to Siam and Cochin China” appeared.

<sup>2</sup> On this sort of “authority claim”, see *Adams 1983*, pp.94-95 and 247-251. For an interesting analysis of this topic in the case of the publications of Sir James Brooke’s (allegedly) raw and unedited journal extracts in the 1840s and 1850s by his advocates within the Royal Navy and his lobbyists at home, see *Hampson*, pp.66-68.

<sup>3</sup> See also *Livingstone 2003*, p.164 (“Simplicity and precision had the ring of truth; ornamentation and decoration did not”). However, as demonstrated by Arnold, many travellers applied the direct opposite rhetorical strategy and conscientiously invoked such literary conventions, or tropes, as were supposed to convey the most authentic impression of the Orient; “references to such self-consciously “Oriental” works as Southey’s *Kehama* (1810) and Moore’s *Lalla Rookh* (1817) infuse the travel literature of the period and, though their authors [i.e. Southey and Moore] had never visited India, their works were repeatedly taken as authoritative guides to the country, its society and scenery”, *Arnold 2005*, p.95.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1829a*, p.107: “Throughout the whole of the negotiation, notes were carefully taken down on the spot”, “and the questions and answers of the Burmese negotiators were taken down *generally word for word*” (my italics).

<sup>5</sup> *Crawford 1829a*, p.264.

either landscapes, natural history, societal mores and traditions, or the history – in many instances these were indeed very clearly attached retrospectively to the narrative.<sup>1</sup>

The structure of the latter half of the books was organized according to the thematic criteria contained in the approach of conjectural history; here the de-personalized descriptive mode enjoyed a primacy over a subject-centred narrative mode, and Crawford et al only appeared in the role of the passive observer, never as actors in their own right. As in HIA, they began with a geographical sketch, followed by a description of the inhabitants' physiognomy,<sup>2</sup> as well as their dresses and physical adornments; then they provided an analysis of the level of civilization of the described society through a delineation of the progress in "the useful arts" (i.e. architecture and production of agricultural tools, metal artefacts, cotton, ceramics, etc.) and in "the higher branches of knowledge", such as systems of weight & measurement, calendars, notions of mathematical concepts and navigational skills. After this, they presented the main traits and historical stage of the society with regard to language, literature, religion, government (especially concerning the administration, jurisprudence, revenue collecting, and property rights), military, trade, and lastly its history – both civil & natural. This *civil history* was composed of a narrative based on written and oral indigenous sources and, where available, European ditto.

The two parts both belonged to the same *colonial genre* of the travelogue;<sup>3</sup> yet they also *appeared* to constitute two different *investigative modalities*, 1) the *observational*, or *travel*, modality and 2) the *historiographic* one. Discursively, the content of the travelogues was represented as if composed by two connected *levels of knowledge*: that of a direct information gathering and processing through observation and action, facilitated by the act of travelling, and the level of theorizing upon this information in order to deduct some general patterns, structures, or trajectories. Or, as C.A. Bayly argued, the latter belonged to "the level of formal, learned and abstract knowledge which has become associated with the term Orientalism", while the former rather expressed "a level of practical, *ad hoc*, 'satisficing' administration".<sup>4</sup> Yet, as I will endeavour

---

<sup>1</sup> Adams denominated these descriptive parts as *digressions*, and he stressed that these most often were inserted quite late in process of production of the text: "Few travelers through history, however, have supplied all their "digressions" in the first draft of a journal or diary; such side trips, such history or geography, and such erudition or tales take time, planning, reflection, a study desk, books, and a rewriting of whatever notes were taken on the spot" (Adams 1983, p.208). For further reflections on this topic, see pp.204-212.

<sup>2</sup> These descriptions were not based on statistical surveys but on what was conceived as constituting a "singular standard specimen" of the group. (Thomas, p.82) Such an operation permitted "a more complex conceptual operation, since the description shifts from the concrete and observable facts ..., to the generalized disquisition upon species [or racial/national in the case of human beings] character" (Thomas, p.83). From this further inferences on national character, etc. could be drawn. Plenty of examples of this can be found in e.g. Crawford, 1828a, pp.310-312 & 481-482 and Crawford 1829a, pp.372-373, but even more interesting in this context was Finlayson's explanation of the theories and methods behind this mode of proceeding (Finlayson, pp.224-227); Finlayson, a Scottish educated surgeon in the service of EIC's army, accompanied Crawford on the Embassy to Siam and Cochin China as surgeon and naturalist.

<sup>3</sup> On travel as a *colonial practice* and the implications of this, see e.g. Thomas, pp.5-6 and Pratt 1992, esp. chapters 1-2.

<sup>4</sup> Bayly 1996, p.167.

to demonstrate in the following, the relationship between these two levels were not as one-way directed as discursively indicated by the structure of these travelogues, and the “practical, *ad hoc*” level was, in some ways, more profoundly informed by the ideas of conjectural history and affiliated demographic theories than it apparently appeared in the text.

### 3.2.2 Construing from Absence: Observing through Seeing What is not There.

In the introduction to his long *durée* survey on European theories on travel, J. Stagl enumerated three types of ‘basic research methods’ for obtaining information, or knowledge, about the world in general, and the foreign spaces and their inhabitants in particular: “These are 1) *direct exploration by means of observation, inspection and manipulation*; 2) *indirect exploration by interviewing others who have done this*; and 3) *indirect exploration via significant phenomena*”.<sup>1</sup> With regard to the first method he states that “this is called *travel* when it leads out of the experienced world of the researcher”;<sup>2</sup> this ‘direct exploration’, or observation, was, however, in fact seldom as ‘direct’ as Stagl seemed to suggest. The process of observing *and* naming includes a linguistic process too, and as such it involves a set of preconceived conceptions and a notion about the internal relationship between these conceptions.<sup>3</sup>

In order to illustrate this I will offer one example here, namely the observation of a *ruin*, something that occurred frequently in these travelogues; for instance, as when Crawford recounted his experiences of a visit to the remnants of an ancient settlement on the island of Singapore:

“Among these ruins, the most distinguished are those seated on a square terrace, of about forty feet to a side, near the summit of the hill. On the edge of this terrace, we find fourteen large blocks of sandstone; which, from the hole in each, had probably been the pedestals of as many wooden-posts which supported the building. This *shows us*, at once, that the upper part of the structure was of perishable materials; an *observation* which, no doubt, applies to the rest of the buildings as well as to this. ... for *I look upon* the building to have been a place of worship, and, from its appearance, in all likelihood, a temple of Buddha. I venture farther to conjecture, the other relics of antiquity on the hill, are the remains of monasteries of the priests of this religion.”<sup>4</sup>

So, what does it *mean* actually to observe a ‘ruin’? One observes in the spatial field available to the visual examination some kind of material structure; first, this is regarded as having been

---

<sup>1</sup> Stagl 1995, p.3.

<sup>2</sup> Stagl 1995, p.4.

<sup>3</sup> Obviously this process is based on a *perception* of the phenomena of the world, but several processes are involved in, if not in the experience per se, then definitely in the representation of it; these must include a linguistic process, and hence also an inscription into the intricate web of meaning that invariably constitutes a language.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.46. The italicised words are marked in order to highlight the references to visual observation, either literally or in a more metaphorical manner. Even, or perhaps especially, these metaphorical allusions suggested the ‘not-so-direct’ nature of the observation and what it entailed.

constructed by human beings, and secondly it is assumed that it in the past has had another, more complete, aspect. By the concept of *ruin* a temporal dimension is thus introduced into the spatial field of *direct observation*; this temporal dimension cannot, by its very nature, be of a direct, observational character. Furthermore, it also implies a notion of decay: the word ruin points to the fact that the observed phenomenon is not exhibiting all that it is assumed to once have been, that the token of time has taken its toll upon it. Or, in other words, a ruin represents more than meets the eye; it invariably inscribes the observed phenomenon into the trope of degeneration. And this is regardless whether the degenerative character normatively is perceived in a romantic gaze, as alluding to the former grandeur of the building, or it is regarded as sad remnants pointing to the gloomy ‘fact’ that the contemporary society cannot preserve, live up to, or outdo the level of civilization that it once, in some distant past, possessed.<sup>1</sup>

Not only did (the textual representation of) *direct observation* include epistemological steps which implied some preconceived notions of the observed phenomena, such as situating them within a dynamics of past, present, and future; however, the authority derived from direct observation was sometimes also invoked in what Stagl called *indirect exploration* via *significant phenomena*. That is, what had been inferred from a set of theoretical principles and premises was in the text represented as being the result of observation – and hence attributed with the same evidential qualities as any other authoritative observation. The following, by no means exceptional, example is from “Journal of an Embassy...to the Court of Ava”, and it is an emblematic instance of ‘observing Oriental despotism’ by discursively transferring a theoretical inference to the realm of direct observation.

Quoting at length from “the journal of a voyage to Martaban [a coastal region which had belonged to the Kingdom of Ava], which I performed about ten months before the time of which I am now writing”<sup>2</sup> (i.e. in April 1826) Crawford described the appearance of the town of Martaban and its inhabitants, and at end he stated that:

“The Chinese are very few in number, a fact which, in a country understocked with inhabitants, calculated by nature for agricultural and commercial pursuits, and removed from their own at no very inconvenient distance, must be considered the *certain sign of a bad government*.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Chapter 3 in Arnold 2005 analysed the different discursive invocations of ruins in British early 19<sup>th</sup> century descriptions of India, and it was stressed how “the idea of India in ruins, especially when it extended beyond “picturesque” views of crumbling palaces and decaying tombs to become a metaphor for the country at large, communicated a far more censorious meaning.” (p.76). For the attraction and excavation of ruins in Southeast Asia during the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, see esp. Tiffin 2008, and Tiffin 2009. For a inclusion of the Dutch experiences as well, see Diaz-Andreu, pp.215-222, and Ray.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.357.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.363. My italics.

Let us for a brief moment ponder on what is actually stated here, and how it is explained. Or, in other words, how did the observation of only a “few” Chinese become a “certain sign of a bad government”. Such an inference from a direct observation could only obtain validity when it was inscribed into a larger argumentative structure which provided a set of premises and more or less veiled assumptions. First the observation itself: what was actually seen was an absence of as many Chinese settlers as expected; or, to be more exact, it was an absence of seeing as many Chinese as expected. One can obviously not observe an absence, but only *infer* it from the absence of seeing anything.<sup>1</sup> The question in this context is whether Crawford’s absence of observing as many Chinese as expected during his brief stay at Martaban could be interpreted as a reliable indication of a real absence of these Chinese, or whether it only was due to insufficient observational conditions. Given that Crawford’s observation could be relied on, then the conclusion could still only attain its certainty (“must be...the certain sign”) through at least two premises which then each involved several preconceived assumptions. The first of these stated that Martaban, and the rest of Ava, as will be shown later,<sup>2</sup> was “understocked”, or suffered from *underpopulation*; *underpopulation* is obviously a relational term which had to be defined in relation to something else, and Crawford hinted that he opposed the actual situation to the “agricultural and commercial” *potential* of the country. Or to the population that the country could, and perhaps even *ought*, to have had, if this potential, provided by its climatic and geographical situation,<sup>3</sup> had been exploited appropriately. The notion of *underpopulation* seemed to have been widespread in colonial discourses dealing with either vanishing peoples whose utter extinction was deemed inevitable,<sup>4</sup> or concerned with more advanced, but by now stagnant, societies like those caught in the inescapable inertia of Oriental despotism.<sup>5</sup> It derived some of its argumentative authority from a particularly optimistic reading of Malthus’s theories on demographic growth. M.C. Quilty has recently demonstrated how this more sanguine interpretation of the otherwise gloomy scenarios that Malthus conjured up constituted a

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless, of course, one possessed such dexterous observational skills as those attributed to Alice by the King in Lewis Carroll’s *Through the Looking Glass*, when the King asked her: “Just look along the road and tell me if you can see either of them.” ‘I see nobody on the road’ said Alice. ‘I only wish I had such eyes,’ the King remarked in a fretful tone. ‘To be able to see Nobody! And at that distance too! Why, it’s as much as I can do to see real people, by this light!’”

<sup>2</sup> This aspect constituted an important part of Crawford’s discussion on rate of wages in Ava and its civilizational implications.

<sup>3</sup> These factors more specifically referred to Ava’s (assumed) capabilities, as a producer of agricultural products, to sustain a substantially larger population and to increase its export, facilitated by its geographical accessibility and hence its potential for trade: the latter was in these stadial theories considered a vital element for progress. Maritime trade was deemed of special importance in this context; in *Crawford 1829a*, pp.384-385. *The absence of observations of maritime trade* along the Burmese coasts, in spite of their suitability for such traffic, was thus presented as another “proof” of the despotic character of the government of this country.

<sup>4</sup> In *Brantlinger 2003*, the author stressed how Malthus himself argued that “bizarrely, in savagery, the population of overpopulation took the shape of underpopulation” (p.33); this was perceived as abetting their inevitable extinction when faced with modern civilization.

<sup>5</sup> For another example of an analysis of Crawford’s discursive use of the notion of “a fruitful soil, understocked with inhabitants”, see pp.48-51 in *Amigoni*.

consistent feature in most of the British writings on Southeast Asian societies during this period.<sup>1</sup> In these writings the rise in population was intricately linked to the idea of progress in terms of stadial civilization; a progress which relied heavily on a stable and benevolent government: something which often was claimed to be catalysed or at least accelerated when the native societies came under the protective wings of British rule, either as colonies or in a more indirect manner.

Without venturing further into Crawford's explanation of the causes for this underpopulation and granting its validity, the next premise in the argument prescribed that such an underpopulation in a country relatively close to the borders of China would *automatically* cause a massive emigration from China to this country, unless something explicitly impeded such immigration.<sup>2</sup> This premise was most probably derived from a comparative approach that drew upon Crawford's own experiences, observations, and information gathering on Chinese communities existent in the Indian Archipelago, Siam, and Cochin China;<sup>3</sup> as such, this premise appeared quite reasonable. Earlier in the book on his diplomatic mission to Ava he had stated that: "the industrious people [i.e. the Chinese] are to be found in every part of the East, where there is room for the exercise of their useful industry, and, wherever they are found, are always superior to the inhabitants of the countries in which they sojourn".<sup>4</sup> The last element in the argument consisted in establishing that Crawford's failure to observe a massive Chinese immigration in Martaban corroborated the fact that something within the state of Ava necessarily must have impeded such an immigration; how this 'something' unequivocally became equated with "bad government" was not altogether evident, but the general tenor of the text left little doubt that "bad government" should be taken as synonymous with Oriental despotism.<sup>5</sup> That this, the 'something' – which impeded Chinese immigration to Ava and thus to Martaban as well, and which was rhetorically presented as being the result of "bad government" – was perhaps best explained by the fact that Crawford repeatedly emphasised the profound control of the Burmese (i.e. Ava's) *proto-totalitarian* state apparatus upon the society; thence, in the absence of any natural obstacles for Chinese immigration, this must have been

---

<sup>1</sup> See pp.181-199 in *Quilty 2001*.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford's focus seemed here to exclusively have concentrated exclusively on the possibilities to immigrate into a given country, rather than on the Chinese restrictions on emigration: this latter aspect was considered to be the same for all the countries in the region and not specific for any one. Furthermore, Crawford seemed to consider the Chinese potential for emigration as being in praxis limitless; any possible Chinese emigration to Ava would not be prevented or lowered substantially by even better conditions for Chinese immigrants in other parts of the region: in such case, other Chinese would still emigrate to Ava from the seemingly limitless stocks of Chinese.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. HIA Vol.I, pp.134-137, vol.II, pp.456-465 (Chinese in the Philippines); Vol.III, pp.155-184 (on trade with China and Chinese traders); Crawford 1828a, pp551-552 (Chinese in Singapore); *Crawford 1856*, pp.94-98. See also *Crawford 1844*.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1829a*, p.93.

<sup>5</sup> As far as I am aware, the actual phrase *Oriental despotism* appeared nowhere in *Crawford, 1829a*, but otherwise his descriptions of the maladies of the government and its structure in Ava complied with all the topoi normally associated with the trope of Oriental despotism.

prevented by societal factors, and these were in the case of Ava to be equated with the state, or the government, since it entertained an almost absolute control over its subjects.<sup>1</sup>

The critical assessment involved in my presentation of examples should neither be interpreted as a rejection of the validity of Crawford's arguments, nor of his mode of argumentation. On the contrary, I just try to illustrate how the process of observation itself was imbued with a temporality that implied, or at least predisposed, certain historical interpretations, and that any "observation" of such an intangible concept as Oriental despotism could only be carried out by ascribing a specific significance to the observation; this was done by inscribing it into the larger structures of meaning inherent in Crawford's discourses.

### 3.2.3 Shapes of Despotism and Shades of Orientalism.

It was especially through personal observation of the visited areas and their populations that the travelogue derived its claim of providing authentic representations of the visited areas. These observations, like the ones mentioned above, were inscribed into larger frameworks, such as the trope of Oriental despotism, and in conjunction they were then presented as integrative models that explained the encountered, otherwise inexplicably and exotic, phenomena.

In Crawford's travel accounts, despotism was in particular recognized by the ways in which the state power, or the government, interfered disruptively in the civil society.<sup>2</sup> This was illustrated through the combination of 1) a truly absolute Sovereign and the absence of the security of private property, including the right to one's own life, which was totally dependent on the whims of the ruler,<sup>3</sup> even though Crawford allowed a certain notion of private property to be, at least vaguely, recognized in Ava;<sup>4</sup> 2) by the fact that the state power, or the Sovereign himself, held a strict monopoly on some of the most important branches of both internal and external trade;<sup>5</sup> 3) by a formal social stratification of the society that did not correspond with the real power structures within the society, and this especially affected the merchant class in a negative way;<sup>6</sup> 4) through the lack of a proper remuneration of the state officials which gave rise to an endemic corruption and

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1829a*, pp.317& 392.

<sup>2</sup> The notion of *civil society* played a pivotal role in the ideas on the progress of society through various stages of civilization in the Scottish Enlightenment. Thus A. Ferguson's most famous work was entitled *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767) (See *Kettler*).

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.183 ("the Siamese Government, viewing as it does the population of the country as its own private property"), 322-326 (322: "a people who are compelled to devote one-third of the labour of their manhood to the service of a highly oppressive government"), 378-389 (some minor exceptions were allowed with regard to private ownership of the land), 489-492 (on Cochin China), 496-497 (some private property of land in Cochin China, although a very trifle proportion).

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1829a*, pp.85, 98 ("This seems to leave the existence of a private right to the soil clear and unquestionable", which is to be contrasted with the following general evaluation on p.397: "Every Burman is considered the King's slave and a species of property", and p.400: "The King, as he is called, in his customary titles, is the lord of life and property of all his subjects. The country and people are at his entire disposal").

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.143-145, 252.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.88, 133-134, 305, 342, 345, 349; and *Crawford 1829a*, pp.77-78, 106, 395-396, 440.

peculation with devastating results for the society at large;<sup>1</sup> (5) in such a rigidly stratified and stagnant society investments were put into religious and void prestige architecture instead of being vested in practical projects, such as improving the infrastructure, the production facilities, etc..<sup>2</sup> In addition to these characteristics, a more specific *oriental* element was accentuated in the shape of a prevalent indolence among the inhabitants, notwithstanding whether this was explained by recourse to an inherent, and thus racially caused, character of the people, or by the lack of incitement for personal aggrandizement in an exploitative society that did not respect private property;<sup>3</sup> and not at least through detailed accounts of cruel and arbitrary punishments in these societies.<sup>4</sup>

### 3.2.3.1 Oriental Despotism and Social Mobility.

I will in the following, instead of providing an exhaustive analysis of all the instances of Oriental despotism, try to demonstrate its pervasiveness upon the discourse in these travelogues by showing how the observations of two aspects of these societies, which apparently contradicted the existence of Oriental despotism, in the end discursively were presented as constituting *proofs* of how Oriental despotism pervaded them. This will be demonstrated through an analysis of Crawford's focus on the high *social mobility* in these countries and not at least through the analysis of the reasons for the relatively high *wages* paid to normal workers.

One should assume that a Scotsman of rather humble origins, like John Crawford, who, besides, unequivocally hailed the principles of free trade and of a free enterprise, uninhibited by privileges of any kind,<sup>5</sup> would, everything else being equal, appreciate a society characterized by a high rate of social mobility. The key phrase here is "everything else being equal", and although Crawford in the case of Ava stressed that "any subject of the Burmese Government, short of a slave or outcast, may aspire to the first office in the state, and such offices, in reality, are often held by persons of very

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.88, 343-344; and *Crawford 1829a*, pp.195, 278-281, 310-311, 320-321, 424-430.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.99, 114, 117, 260, 279, 325-326: "If nothing existed of Siamese but their temples, we should be apt, upon a superficial consideration, to pronounce them a people considerable civilized, tolerably well governed, and enjoying no small share of happiness and comfort. Extensive monuments of this nature, indeed, could not exist among a race of mere savages; and *their presence argues a certain advance of civilization*, some progress in the art of securing a permanent supply of food, and the existence of a population more numerous than the precarious habits of mere savage life could afford; but beyond this, they can be *adduced in proof of nothing but despotism on the part of the government, and superstition on the part of the people.*" (My italics); and *Crawford 1829a*, pp.45-46, 71-72: "The vast extent of the ruins of Pagan and the extent of its religious edifices, may be considered by some as proofs of considerable civilization and wealth among the Ancient Burmans; but I am convinced there is no foundation whatever for such an inference", 230: "This is a fair sample of the united effects of despotism and superstition among the Burmans." For a similar approach in the travel literature from India, see *Arnold 2005*, p.79.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.53 (Bajau near Singapore, due to low level of civilization), 193, 344 ("the Siamese appeared to us to exhibit in great perfection the indolence, disinclination to labour, contempt for the value of time, and disregard of punctuality which are always so characteristic of the subjects of a bad and barbarous government"); and *Crawford 1829a*, pp.178.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.276-277 (on p.246 Crawford rather ambiguously called Cochin China "a well-flogged nation", i.e. corporal punishment was endemic, but in this exceptional case it actually seemed to work advantageously!), 392, 509; and *Crawford 1829a*, pp.33 (disembowelment in Burma), 215-216, 288, 337-339, 407-408.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Crawford's own political agenda when he unsuccessfully ran for Parliament in the 1830s.



mean origin”,<sup>1</sup> this should not be interpreted as a benign trait. First, this social mobility implied that mean and vulgar people could attain an influence which was inversely proportional with their abilities; they could occupy some of the highest positions in the state, being neither educationally nor morally prepared for the task, and the consequences of this could be dire. The probably most grotesque example was when the king of Ava made his “favourite buffoon” a noble, gave him a big estate as well as appointed him general; meanwhile, he “was discovered to be an atrocious oppressor, having put several persons on his estate to death”, and, just as fast as being appointed, he was stripped of all his privileges and put to prison.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, and infinitely more consequential, was the fact that on this stage of civilization, this particular kind of mobility actually prevented any kind of opposition to the sovereign, whether this opposition was real or merely nominal. Thus the abovementioned quotation on the King’s “buffoon” was preceded by the assertion that:

“The only class of public officers which can be called hereditary under the Burmese Government, are the Thaubwas, or Saubwas, the tributary princes of the subjugated countries. The rest, of the chief officers, at least, are appointed and dismissed at a nod, and neither their titles, rank, nor offices, and very often not even their property, can descend to their children.”<sup>3</sup>

Without a hereditary nobility, or some other group whose privileges did not solely count on the whims of the sovereign, the absolute power of the sovereign would remain unchecked, and hence it could, and did, attain an arbitrary and capricious character. Or, in other words, this *social mobility* was both a consequence of the Government’s Oriental despotism, and it served to underpin and reproduce it. In the case of Siam Crawford’s made an almost similar verdict:

“With a few trifling exceptions in the provinces, there is no hereditary rank in Siam; no aristocracy of wealth or title; the despotism which reigns over all levelling before it every distinction, and rendering all subservient to its pleasure or caprice. The people seem to be considered as the mere slaves of the Government, and valued only in as far as they minister to the pride and consequence of the Sovereign, or of those to whom he delegates any share of his power.”<sup>4</sup>

In contrast to this whimsically unbounded Oriental despotism of Siam and Ava, Crawford put the well-ordered, yet still unbounded, despotic governmental structure of Cochin China:

“The Government of Cochin China is extremely despotical, both in theory and in practice. It pretends, however, like that of China, which it imitates in every thing, to be patriarchal or

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1829a, pp.395-396.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.75. Later he was again restored to his former honours and allowed presence at the court (p.114).

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.395.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.374.

paternal; and the object held out, is to rule the kingdom as a private family – the chief instrument, however, being the rod. Nothing seems to bound the authority of the King, but the fear of insurrection, and such immemorial and indefinite usages exist in all countries, however bad their government. The nobility is entirely a nobility of office, and their power to do good or evil is solely derived from the authority of the sovereign.”<sup>1</sup>

Crawfurd’s books abounded with examples of his appreciation of the Chinese settlers outside China,<sup>2</sup> but as it is clearly stated above he was not, and thus unlike many Enlightenment philosophers, particularly impressed by the Chinese mode of governance, with its meticulous meritocracy subjected to an absolute sovereign. As Jonathan Spence has pointed out, a more hostile and derogative attitude towards China can be detected in British discourses already from Daniel Defoe’s second part of “Robinson Crusoe” (1719) which took place in China; the descriptions from Anson’s circumnavigation in the 1740s and especially from Macartney’s famous embassy only confirmed this impression of a well-structured, but inefficient and obstinate society.<sup>3</sup>

Crawfurd thus seemed to operate with two kinds of Asiatic despotism: one that we might call *Oriental despotism* and another that could be denominated *Chinese despotism*, exemplified by Cochin China. Despite a marked difference between the two – the latter exhibiting a firm and invariable governmental structure while the former seemed much more capriciously governed which reflected the respective levels of civilization of the countries in question<sup>4</sup> – the end result remained the same in both cases: an utterly stagnant state, deprived of any vestige of an independent *civil society*, and where the individual rights were non-existent. This was deemed the case even when empirical examples might indicate the opposite. States ruled by Oriental despotism, regardless of the achieved level of civilization, would thus always be marginalised in the context of the *natural* progress of civilization, such as it was delineated by conjectural history. And hence social mobility did not necessarily constitute as a universally valid moral imperative within the otherwise explicitly universal framework of conjectural history; on the contrary, when rife in a society pertaining to a lower level of civilization, such a social mobility could actually contribute to a derailment of the universal process of progress, if it was practised in an unencumbered manner that did not adhere to any of the rationalities that only would be acknowledged on a more advanced

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1828a*, pp.489-490.

<sup>2</sup> P. Carey, however, asserted that while being employed on occupied Java 1811-16 Crawfurd “sometimes had difficulties disguising his *sinophobic prejudices*” (*Carey 2008*, p.18; my italics). It awaits further research to determine whether the discrepancy between his views then, and the ones expressed in his later publications should be interpreted as a change of mind over time, or whether it is rather attributable to the various functions he occupied and their respective exigencies and accompanying rhetoric.

<sup>3</sup> *Spence*, pp.110-115 (on Defoe), 90-103 (on Anson and Macartney). See also *Jones 2001*, pp.14-52, and *Hillemann*, pp.16-33 for more general discussions hereof.

<sup>4</sup> Among many examples the following is typical: “- the Cochin Chinese exhibiting in this, as on many other occasions, a degree of promptitude and punctuality rarely, if ever, shown among an Eastern people, and which, I think, must always be looked on, where it is found, as indicating a certain advance in civilization.” (*Crawfurd 1828a*, p.238)

stage. It was considerations of this kind that later, under the auspices of an allegedly universalist framework of liberalism, ideologically facilitated a *colonial governmentality* of differential treatment of people on account of the thus devised divergent political exigencies for societies belonging to different (st)ages of civilization, rather than being based on racial differences per se.<sup>1</sup>

### 3.2.3.2 Observing High Wages, Inferring Oriental Despotism.

The relatively high rate of wages in both Siam and Ava provides us with another example of how an observable and apparently benign societal trait in Crawford's discourse came to be interpreted as a sign of oriental despotism. In the journal kept throughout the ascendancy of the river Irrawaddy to the capital of Ava Crawford found several occasions to dwell on the issue of the remarkably high wages in the country; thus, on one occasion he mentioned how:

"We inquired into the wages of agricultural labour, and found them to be from forty to fifty ticals a-year, each tical of one shilling and tenpence sterling; with food, but no clothing.... This is more than double the wages in the neighbourhood of Calcutta, or of any native city in Hindostan or the Peninsula; a proof that the supply of labour is less in proportion to the demand in Ava than in India, and that the condition of the labourer is more comfortable, since there is no great difference in the cost of the necessaries of life."<sup>2</sup>

From observation and interviews it had thus been learned that in the allegedly badly governed state of Ava, the (material) living conditions of the average agricultural labourer<sup>3</sup> was substantially better than in the British administered regions of India. Comparing the vast and untilled tracts of land in the thinly populated Americas with India, Desh-U-Lubun Ocharik would the year after describe the plight of the Indian agriculturalist in the following terms, revealing a similar approach:

"India, on the contrary [to the Americas], a country possessing the greatest antiquity, where the land has long been fully appropriated and cultivated by a comparatively large population, and where the wages are, consequently, so low, as scarcely to afford the cultivator anything beyond the moderate supply of his very simple wants".<sup>4</sup>

This glaring difference in wages certainly called for explanation, unless it was intended to suggest that the British administered regions of India were even worse governed; and, although

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the two were often de facto conflated, and in the racial theories they were considered causally linked. See e.g. *Metha*, p.62: "The distinction between universal capacities and the conditions for their actualization points to a space in which the liberal theorist can, as it were, raise the ante for the political inclusion. To the extent that such a distinction can be identified within the work of a particular theorist or more broadly within liberalism, it points to a theoretical space from within which liberal exclusion can be viewed as intrinsic to liberalism and in which exclusionary strategies become endemic."

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford, 1829a*, pp.99-100.

<sup>3</sup> This was also the case for labourers employed outside the agriculture as is attested in *Crawford 1829a*, pp.467-469.

<sup>4</sup> *Ocharik*, p.59.

Crawfurd never hesitated to exhibit his sceptical opinions on the East India Company's monopolies, there is absolutely no indication of such an intention here.<sup>1</sup>

So, in order to understand this, on the surface somewhat self-contradictory, interpretation it will be necessary to examine the general manner in which Crawfurd addressed the issue of labour and its remuneration.<sup>2</sup> That he perceived labour, or more precisely labour demanding processes, as conducive to the advancement of civilization was clearly attested by his ardent enthusiasm in proving a causal relation between societies that favoured the labour-intensive production of cereal, or subsidiary rice, and those having attained a high stage of civilization on the one hand, and on the other the attempt to correlate primitive societies with such relatively effort-less modes of food production as the extraction of sago;<sup>3</sup> in the latter there was no incentive to work, and hence societies based on this production mode could never rise above the level of the lowest subsistence economy. A high stage of civilization was thus dependent on, and simultaneously it nurtured, a hard and/or efficient labour process. In more advanced societies, containing a paid labour force, the size of the wages would thus be indicative of the (relative) civilizational level of this labour force; in his description of the "multiethnic" workforce in British administered Penang Crawfurd stated that:

"The rate of wages paid to the different classes [here synonymous with *nations* or *races*], when *engaged in similar labour*, affords a very striking picture of their relative skill, industry, and physical strength – in a word, *perhaps of their relative state of civilization*. ... I have little doubt but a scale might be constructed upon this principle, which would *exhibit a very just estimate of the comparative state of civilization among nations*, or, which is the same thing, *of the respective merits of their different social institutions*."<sup>4</sup>

In his sketch of the conditions in the newly founded Singapore, this mode of comparison was even quantified, and it was suggested that "the average value of the labour, skill, and intelligence of a Chinese to be in proportion of three to one to those of a native of the continent of India".<sup>5</sup> The common denominator of both Penang and Singapore, apart from being administered by the East India Company, was that they enjoyed a rather free flux of immigration, and due to this they were entrepôts not only of trade but also of people;<sup>6</sup> in other words, they constituted a *free market* of labour, and Crawfurd's theories were considered applicable without any reservations in these two

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1828 and 1829, i.e. the same years as the publications of his two travelogues, he also published two editions of a highly critical pamphlet entitled "A View of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Free Trade and Colonisation of India". (Crawfurd 1828b and Crawfurd 1829b)

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd often referred to both Adam Smith and David Ricardo in his writings. (esp. in HIA)

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. HIA, Vol.I, pp.15-16; Crawfurd 1856, p.372, and Crawfurd 1828a, p.54. The (alleged) differences in nutritional value between the various crops did also enter in the considerations, yet Crawfurd repeatedly focussed on the accompanying labour process in the cultivation of these crops as well – and thus also in the 'cultivation' of society.

<sup>4</sup> Crawfurd 1828a, p.20. My italics. Quilty 2001, pp.230-231 for her assessment of this aspect in Crawfurd's discourse.

<sup>5</sup> Crawfurd 1828a, p.554; similar comparisons was undertaken at p.20.

<sup>6</sup> See Quilty 2002.

ports. Crawford's discourse here thus epitomized what J.M. Hobson has labelled a *racialized notion of the 'market standard of civilization'* which was inherent, even if often only tacitly assumed, in 19<sup>th</sup> C. British imperial discourses, and against which "all civilizations would be judged."<sup>1</sup>

These theories were, however, not considered applicable in neither Siam nor Ava. High wages in these countries did not necessarily reflect high efficiency; rather they revealed an imminent shortage of labour supply – that is, an *underpopulation*. Especially in the description of the situation in Ava, Crawford devoted much space to explain why high wages here were caused by underpopulation, and how this underpopulation had been generated by the prevalent maladies of Oriental despotism. In discussing the (conjectured) demographic data<sup>2</sup> of the kingdom of Ava Crawford stated that:

"When it is considered that the greater part of the country is still in a state of nature; that the inhabitants are in a semi-barbarous state, possessing neither agricultural, commercial, or manufacturing industry; that they are egregiously misgoverned; and, finally, that in a fertile territory and favourable climate, where there is room for a dense population, *the effectual wages of labour are not low, as in fully-peopled countries, but high, as in thinly-inhabited ones*, it is impossible to believe but that such estimates [former estimates on size of the population] are greatly over-rated."<sup>3</sup>

Here the question of the relative size of the wages was inscribed into an analytical grid where different aspects of society were combined into a single approach; it was thus incorporated in a research that also included considerations on the civilizational level of the society, its governmental mode, and its level of material production compared to its *potential*, as deducted from its environmental and geographical capacities. Of special importance here is the fact that the connexion between the rate of the wages and the demographics of the country was *not* presented as a result of the examination, but rather it entered into the argument as one of the assumed premises upon which conclusions regarding the size of the population could be assessed, when it was corroborated by observation and interrogation that the effectual wages were high. If the country in question was thinly populated, then a high rate of wages went from being a sign of the civilizational level to become certain evidence of an underpopulated society.<sup>4</sup> The, as mentioned before, relational concept of underpopulation seemed in Crawford's discourses to have constituted an anomaly, a

---

<sup>1</sup> Hobson 2006, p.65.

<sup>2</sup> On the use of this *conjectural approach* within the realms British India see also Dirks 1993, esp. pp.286-287; for instance Mackenzie often preferred to apply this, admittedly more insecure, method rather than engaging in "a direct census activity" on the grounds that it was less overt, and thus it was not as prone to stir up local resistance among both the South Indian villagers and their native masters who saw the latter method as a challenge to their power basis and a threat to their economic basis.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1829a, p.464; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> 'Thinly populated' was not identical with 'underpopulated'; places like the Asian steppes were thinly populated but not necessarily underpopulated, the latter included an unexploited potential which was exposed by a high rate of wages.

deviance from the *natural* demographical structures, and hence it needed to be explained; some specific causes must have existed which impeded the natural growth of the population, notwithstanding the usual checks such as diseases,<sup>1</sup> abstinence and celibacy,<sup>2</sup> etc. as well as the occasional wars and natural disasters.<sup>3</sup> This implied that underpopulation could only attain its meaning within a specific context of demographical theory which, although explicitly absent throughout the texts, still permeated them, and here it would be interesting to know more about Crawford's readings of, for instance, T. Malthus' "An Essay on the Principles of Population" and of the demographic debates which ensued after the publications of this influential book.<sup>4</sup>

After having established that underpopulation gave rise to high wages, the next step was to link underpopulation with the governmental mode of Oriental despotism in such a way that that latter proved to be a cause for underpopulation. Most often this link was, however, presented as being evident without much further explanation.<sup>5</sup> Regarding Ava it was thus stated that:

"This is, indeed, a miserable population for a great country, possessing a good climate, a fertile soil, navigable rivers, and convenient harbours. *The great check to population is bad government, in the form of wars, insurrections, anarchy, ill-administered laws, and oppressive taxation.* Famines do not appear to have been frequent, and such as have occurred are rather to be ascribed to civil and political causes than to the soil or climate."<sup>6</sup>

Furthermore, it was added that "prudential motives have little influence among the Burmans in repressing the increase of the population".<sup>7</sup> Similar arguments were put forward in the analysis of the conditions in Siam:

"The area of the country being estimated at 190,000 square miles, it follows, that the population is only at the rate of between fourteen and fifteen inhabitants to the square mile, -

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford continually stressed the salubrious conditions of these countries; see e.g. *Crawford 1828a*, pp.454-455 (Siam) and *Crawford 1829a*, pp.466-467 (Ava). In the case of Cochin China Crawford did not elaborate so much on this topic; perhaps it was because Crawford inscribed this country within a discourse of civilization rather than within the trope of tropicity which was characterized by a greater rule of nature over man. (Arnold 2005, pp.136-137)

<sup>2</sup> Crawford mentioned that approx. 1/40 of the Siamese spent a period of their life as priests, and it "must prove a serious check to the progress of population", which then provided a check on the population. (*Crawford 1828a*, p.454)

<sup>3</sup> In *Crawford 1828a*, p.454, references were made to the first documented world-wide reaching cholera pandemic which broke out in India and quickly spread to Southeast Asia; Crawford stated that "of this malady it may safely be asserted, that it is by far the most destructive which ever afflicted the human race". See also *Porter*, pp.402-404.

<sup>4</sup> This book went through 6 editions from 1798-1826. Malthus taught at the East India Company's College at Haileybury from 1805, and even though Crawford never went there, their association with the East India Company might have effected a connection between the two. See *Quilty 2001*, chapters 3-4 on these topics in the colonial setting.

<sup>5</sup> Unlike in already "filled" Europe, population growth was deemed both a moral good and a vehicle for economic growth in the assumed underpopulated countries in the East (most of Asia, apart from parts of India and China). See *Quilty 2001*, pp.52-55 & 181-199. See esp. p.220 for Quilty's analysis of Crawford's implicit invocation of Malthus's theories in his description of Burmese society, demography, and "labour market".

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1829a*, p.466.

<sup>7</sup> *Crawford 1829a*, p.467. The absence of these "prudential motives" included late marriage, restrictions upon sexual activity, prostitution (a widespread dissemination of prostitutes could, apparently, serve as a check on population growth as a, possibly less demanding, alternative to sexual abstinence!), abortion, and infanticide. See also *Crawford 1828a*, pp.520-522 for an analysis of the importance of these factors for the Cochin Chinese society.

*a miserable proportion for a kingdom of such extent, and affording conclusive evidence of barbarism and bad government.... there can be no doubt whatever but that, for so extensive a country, it is extremely scanty and insignificant, when compared even with any tolerably civilized and well-governed country of Asia.*"<sup>1</sup>

In explaining the links between 'high wages  $\leftarrow$  underpopulation  $\leftarrow$  Oriental despotism',<sup>2</sup> the latter relation thus relied more on indirect and suggestive linkages than on a well attested causal connection. It was simply assumed that Oriental despotism could be identified by "wars, insurrections, anarchy, ill-administered laws, and oppressive taxation", and if it could be argued that no other, more *natural*, causes were likely to have effected the underpopulation, then, by the rule of elimination, Oriental despotism would seem to be the most probable culprit. A more direct explanation for the high wages was, however, encountered in the descriptions of Siam and Cochin China: namely that of the state's enforced conscription of labourers on a grand scale.

"The checks to population, in a country of which the land is often fertile, and always abundant, the communication generally easy, and the climate favourable, may be described at once to be comprised in barbarism and bad government. *The conscription, already described, is the most palpable shape in which they operate.*"<sup>3</sup>

The same system was apparently in force in Cochin China: "In Cochin China, as in Siam, the Government claims the services of the whole male adult population; an institution which appears to have existed for ages, and which forms the worst feature of administration".<sup>4</sup> Such a system of enforcing, or conscripting, a huge amount of the available labour force through a longer period of time was deemed to be yet another sign of Oriental despotism;<sup>5</sup> it would bring about a higher wage-rate, both by causing underpopulation through the disruptive effects of this 'maladministration', and also in a more direct way simply by diminishing the amount of available *free labour*,<sup>6</sup> when so many were conscripted to do inefficient and idle work for the state, more often than not engaged in constructing prestigious and useless buildings. In Cochin China this system of conscription not only

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1828a*, p.452. My italics.

<sup>2</sup> The arrows show the deductive process in the argument; Oriental despotism caused an underpopulation which then resulted in high wages. According to the argument these were sufficient causes. The reading direction indicates the conjectures from "observed" high wages over underpopulation to Oriental despotism; the rhetorical challenge here was to argue convincingly that the causes were not only sufficient but also in the specific cases necessary: so that e.g. underpopulation in the case of Ava &c. could not have been caused by anything else but Oriental despotism.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1828a*, p.453. My italics.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawfurd 1828a*, p.491.

<sup>5</sup> In contrast to e.g. feudalism's decentralised villeinage system this type of conscription was organized by the state power and it had an all-encompassing nature; thus it did not constitute a check to the absolute power of the despot, but on the contrary it reified it. In Wittfogel's book this constituted one of these criteria of Oriental despotism.

<sup>6</sup> On the definition of- and debates on the notion of *free labour* in an Southeast Asian context, see *Quilty 2001*, pp.244-260; p.246 regarding the ascribed conditions of the labourer in states under the sway of Oriental despotism.

gave rise to wages that were twice as big as those in Calcutta,<sup>1</sup> but also to what Crawford saw as an anomaly in the relationship between the sexes; due to the conscription of the males:

“The women in Cochin China perform a large share of such labour as, in other countries, belongs to the male sex only.... In most of these cases, they [the women] are considered more expert and intelligent than the men, but what is more extraordinary, and what I have never heard of in any other country, their labour is generally of equal value; so that, in fact, here there is no distinction in amount between male and female labour, as in other parts of the world; the waste idleness of the public service [i.e. the system of proscription] depreciating the first, and habits of industry *raising the last to an unnatural equality with it*.... Under such circumstances, it is hardly to be supposed that Cochin Chinese husbands are likely to be much loved or respected.”<sup>2</sup>

Thus Oriental despotism permeated the structure of the society even down to the individual family, and the high wages constituted just one benevolent effect amongst a plethora of malevolent consequences. Yet Crawford’s interest in the single positive effect is intriguing; he was well aware of, and appreciated, this apparently paradoxical relationship; with regard to Siam he asserted that:

“The condition of the lower classes of society is notwithstanding, I am led to believe, more easy and comfortable, as far as the mere necessities of life are concerned, than might, on a first and superficial view, be expected from the character of the Government [Oriental despotism]. In short, the excesses of the latter keep down the number of the labourers, and so far improves the condition of this class of people.”<sup>3</sup>

And regarding Ava this stance was articulated even clearer:

“In the mean while, it is some satisfaction to find that *the high rate of wages among the Burmans tends greatly to mitigate the despotism, which, by repressing population, gives rise to it*. Owing to high wages, and probably to this alone, the labouring classes are, upon the whole, well-fed, clad, and housed; a fact which is soon observed by a stranger, and, taking place under such apparently inauspicious circumstances, appears at first view so unaccountable. In fact, the Burmese peasantry are in more comfortable and easy circumstances than the mass of the labouring poor in any of our Indian provinces; and, making allowance for climate, manners, and habits, might bear a comparison with the peasantry of most European countries. As long as land capable of yielding corn with little labour continues to bear the same large proportion to the population as at present, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.522.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1828a, pp.522-523; this meant that women were employed as cultivators of the land, shopkeepers, brokers, and money-changers. My italics.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.453.



government cannot rob the peasantry of the mere wages of personal labour; nay, its interference tends only to enhance or insure them. *The scantiness of the population is in this manner an advantage to the people.*”<sup>1</sup>

Taken into consideration the general tenor of the writings there can be no doubt that, despite the relatively high living conditions of the common labourer, the political regime of Oriental despotism was never embraced affectionately by Crawford. Its maladies still vastly outdid the more agreeable effects in the form of high wages; furthermore these were only produced by an underpopulation which seems thus to have represented more than just a purely descriptive concept. Underpopulation also had a normative tinge, probably due to the fact that underpopulation was deemed to be a deviance from the *natural* process; thence it had to be caused by some inhibiting factor, and, if the natural process was equated with the desired process, such as it was the case in conjectural history, then both the deviance and its cause could hardly be appraised as anything else but an intrusive element that arrested the general progress of the society. And this regardless whether it, to a certain extent, provided its inhabitants with what might appear to be favourable conditions at the moment.

### **3.3 The Origin of Oriental Despotism in Crawford's Conjectural History.**

In his analysis in HIA<sup>2</sup> of the origins and the impact of Oriental despotism in the Indian Archipelago, Crawford made use of the *historiographic modality*;<sup>3</sup> and this to such a degree that he was himself almost totally absent in the de-personified discourse, except for a few incidental allusions to own observations, and these were normally banished to the footnotes. Its universal content and generalising explanations placed it within the most abstract *level of knowledge*.

Crawford concluded that the concept of private property was almost absent in the Indian Archipelago. This he attributed to the perseverant presence of Oriental despotism; in describing the general state of government in the region his verdict was clear: “in short, the monarchs of Java may be considered as among the most absolute of eastern potentates”.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, these societies exhibited all the usual traits of an Oriental despotic rule: the nobility was not hereditary but always appointed directly by the monarch who could just as easily remove them from all their privileges; hence they could not form a check to the unbalanced power of the monarch.<sup>5</sup> In theory all the

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1829a, pp.468-469; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> There was no specific chapter on Oriental despotism in HIA; it was primarily analysed in Vol.III, Book VIII, on “Political Institutions”, rather than in Vol.II's books on “Religion” and “History”; the rationale for this will hopefully become apparent at the end of this subchapter.

<sup>3</sup> Cohn 1996, p.5-6.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.15. What was not so clear, though, was whether this referred to the present state of affairs, e.g. in Yogyakarta, where he spent a considerable amount of time as resident, and thus could have observed these ‘facts’ himself (he makes no references to personal observations in this part of the text), or whether it primarily referred to the state of affairs in a more ‘original’ stage of civilization.

<sup>5</sup> HIA, Vol.III, pp.31-35.

subjects were slaves of the monarch who thus, in principle, could do with them as he pleased,<sup>1</sup> and this paved the way for arbitrary and cruel forms of punishment;<sup>2</sup> among the Javanese, the most advanced people, “the property right of the sovereign in the soil is most unequivocally established, and, perhaps, most arbitrarily established”.<sup>3</sup>

Crawfurd traced the origins of this political structure to more universal elements, existent in the progression of all *tropical* societies. In his recent book, D. Arnold emphasised both the differences and the similarities between the trope of Orientalism and the emerging one of tropicality in the British descriptions of India in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>4</sup> Sometimes these approaches also seem to have merged, such as, for instance, in the case of Crawfurd’s analysis of Oriental despotism where an original oriental trait was not only transplanted to a tropical climate, but its genesis was explained in terms delineated by a more scientifically orientated discourse normally associated with this trope.<sup>5</sup> Thus, granting that in the movement towards despotism within the Indian Archipelago, “Mahomedan and Hindu religions have contributed, with these internal causes of change, to the establishment of uncontrolled despotism among these tribes”,<sup>6</sup> these influences from the Asiatic mainland were nevertheless presented more as accelerators than as the catalyst, and the attention of the analysis was directed more towards “*these internal causes*”. These causes should be sought in the societal process of progression; that is, according to the principles of conjectural history. Crawfurd stated that in his own time:

“Examples of every form of social union from the equality which reigns among savages, to the most absolute form of *oriental despotism*, may be found within the wide range of the Indian islands. In *these regions*, the more abject the state of man in the scale of social improvement, the freer the form of his government; and in proportion as he advances in

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.III, 26.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.135-137; the more sophisticated kinds of torture were, however, said to be introduced from the Asiatic mainland: “In their legal punishments there are no symptoms of inhuman refinement, the origin of which can be traced to their own manners” (HIA, Vol.I, p.52). Rather they were just ferocious like the savage North American Indians, whereas e.g. “the cruel and unjust punishment of mutilation” had been introduced by the Muslims. (HIA, Vol.III, p.107)

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.50. However, it should be emphasized that Crawfurd did not necessarily consider this despotism the worst alternative which the population in these regions faced; thus, for instance, in HIA, Vol.III, pp.26-27 he asserted that “Their [i.e. the population] condition is invariably most easy and comfortable, where the absolute authority of one despot has superseded that of many. They even enjoy a larger share of personal freedom under such a government; for their immediate rulers are in some degree responsible. The government is also more regularly administered, and, therefore, there is less anarchy and disorder. Wherever there exist numerous petty states, there is perpetual warfare and contention; and the people are bought and sold without mercy. Thus slavery and rapine are more general under the federal governments of Celebes, than under any of the absolute governments”. These apparently ameliorating *actual* circumstances did not, however, detract any of the harsh critique of the *system* of Oriental despotism in HIA, and hence his stance cannot be equated with that of Munro, Malcolm, and Elphinstone who all advocated “a “progressive”, constitutionally regulated, European-type authoritarianism” (McLaren 2001, p.191)

<sup>4</sup> Arnold 2005, p.144.

<sup>5</sup> Where “Orientalism had been resonant with history”, and hence drew its explanations especially from historical sources, “the tropics, by contrast, ..., had no history”, and due to this reason other explanative modes had to be devised (Arnold 2005, p.136). These were primarily provided by applying a scientific method to the subject area.

<sup>6</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.11.

civilization, is that freedom abridged, until, at the top of the scale, he is subjected to a tyranny where not a vestige of liberty is discoverable. In short, he enjoys freedom when he has nothing else worth enjoying; and when the comforts of civil life accumulate around him, he is deprived of the liberty of benefiting by them. *No nation, indeed, inhabiting a warm climate has ever known how to reconcile freedom and civilization.* In that portion of the globe there is hardly any medium between the unbounded licence of *savage independence* and *uncontrolled despotism.*”<sup>1</sup>

Still Crawford listed “no fewer than five distinct forms of social union”<sup>2</sup> to be existent in the region, with despotism representing the most advanced form in terms of level of civilization. After having inscribed these into the interpretive dynamics of conjectural history he concluded that: “I have no doubt, that, wherever, in the Archipelago, despotic government is now established, it must have passed successively through all the other four modes of government adverted to in tracing the history of the forms of political association.”<sup>3</sup> The question arising out of this analysis is why has this *natural* process, as described in and delineated by conjectural history, resulted in an utterly despotic mode of government in the Indian Archipelago, whereas Europe developed more ‘balanced’ forms of government – such as a monarchy checked by a hereditary nobility and later also by a burgeoning bourgeoisie?

First, a general and schematic description of the *universal* process and the different stages of the earliest state formation was provided, and then the text went on to furnish more specific details on how this had happened in the Indian Archipelago; the connection between these two levels of description was allegedly this: “these *abstract reflections on the progress of society and government* are *naturally obtruded upon our attention by those practical illustrations which our observation of the manners of the Indian islanders is constantly presenting*”.<sup>4</sup> It thus appeared not to be based solely on a pure deduction from the main principles of conjectural history, but rather it was presented as drawing its conclusions just as much upon an empirical, inductive foundation of contemporary observations of societies and governmental forms still existent in the region. It seems almost needless to add that such an inductive inference was deeply dependent upon the speculative criteria of conjectural history, both with regard to the thus procured ability to observe the past in the present and in the way these *observational facts* “naturally obtruded upon our attention” in a such a

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.III, pp.3-4; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.11. These forms were: 1) “the rudest savages, among whom no subordination is recognized, and none required”; 2) “the simplest form of elective magistracy”; 3) “hereditary monarchy”; 4) “elective confederacies”; 5) “unlimited despotism”. Apart from the “rude savages” and the existence of some kind of monarchy and/or confederacy on Celebes the text did not dwell much with the first four parts though – rather they seemed just to play the part of rhetorical stepping stones carefully laid out in order to underpin his argument.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.III, pp.21-22. These inferences were thus based solely on conjectural history, without any evidence from earlier or contemporary observations, written sources, language, or material relics.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.10; my italics.

manner that they could only interpreted as composing different steps or stages in the same, uniform process of progress of civilization. Indeed, there could not be much “natural” about this inference, unless it was firmly embedded in conjectural history.

In his more detailed description of the process particular to the Indian Archipelago, the fundamental cause for the prevalence of the despotic mode of government was identified in the climate, geography, and the richness of the soil. Or, in other words, in environmentalist factors.

“The possession of wealth, the necessary consequence of a soil of great fertility, encouraged in Java the progress of absolute power, by strengthening the hands of those in authority. The devotion of the people to agricultural industry by *rendering themselves more tame*, and more at the mercy of power than the wandering tribes, and *their property more tangible*, went still farther towards it, for *wherever, in the east, agriculture is the principal pursuit, there it may certainly be reckoned, that the people will be found living under an absolute government.*”<sup>1</sup>

Combined with the lack of ever having experienced the pastoral stage of civilization,<sup>2</sup> this implied that the Indian Archipelago was inhabited by petty despotisms, each holding their absolutist sway over a small amount of land.<sup>3</sup> This seemed to have prevented the region from experiencing the same huge, despotic state-formations as were usually the rule on the Asiatic mainland.

The more ‘technical’ details involved in the process of creating an Oriental despotism were elaborated in HIA’s chapter on “Public Revenue”.<sup>4</sup> This process was intricately connected to the origin and introduction of the concept of *land tax*. Beginning with a universal description of how the soil first was tilled, land appropriated, and land-rent extracted by the ruler in the same universal manner all over the world, HIA then traced the origin of Oriental despotism (in the Indian Archipelago) to the introduction of the culture of (wet) rice; from this point of departure it proceeded to explain in staunch materialistic terms the gradual introduction of a despotic rule. The explanation is worth quoting at some length since it elucidates the core of the argument and provides a fine example of the general explanative mode applied in HIA:

This expensive and rude process [i.e. the first examples of ‘slash and burn’ agriculture], from its very nature, supposes the land unappropriated; and, wherever it is practised, we find that no rent is pretended to be extracted. The appropriation of land, and the extraction of rent, in these countries, increased with the introduction of that improved husbandry of rice

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.24; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> “The shepherd state, the offspring of the cold and immeasurable plains of Tartary, and the school of both war and government, could have no existence among the woods, the narrow valleys, and soft climate of Java. The Javanese are *naturally* an unwarlike people, and it is the necessary consequence of their luxurious climate.” (HIA, Vol.II, p.296, Crawford’s italics). Quilty is also attentive to this point in *Quilty 1998*, p.72.

<sup>3</sup> This was combined with the “feebleness, unskilfulness, and barbarism even of the most improved of the nations of the Indian islands, have always prevented them from establishing permanent empires, and the most considerable states have been but of momentary duration.” (HIA, Vol.III, p.25)

<sup>4</sup> See esp. pp.47-62 in HIA, Vol.III.

which consists in growing it by the help of water; a fortunate discovery, which places, of itself, the agriculture of a rude people, in point of productiveness, on a level with that of the most civilized nations. The appropriation of the most fertile lands, *and those most conveniently situated for irrigation*, with the construction of water courses and dikes, is at once the creation of a property of the most valuable description; and a demand of rent must have been coëval with it. Wherever *this description of husbandry prevails, the pretence for the sovereign's first demand of a share of the produce may be traced to the necessity of vesting in the state a general superintendence of the distribution of that water of irrigation on which the whole success rests, and which could not, without loss and inconvenience, be left in private hands.* It is remarkable that the sovereigns of Bali,<sup>1</sup> as will be afterwards pointed out, though among the most absolute, claim the tax on land solely on the principle of distributing and supplying the water of irrigation. *It may, indeed, be suspected that the early establishment of this right or prerogative has afforded the sovereign one of the principal means of subverting the equality of society, and of establishing absolute power.*

The legitimate impost exacted as the reward of superintending the water of irrigation, increases in the progress of arbitrary power, and, accordingly, among every tribe where *the right of property in the land is established, that is, among the whole of the civilized tribes, the sovereign, in one shape or another, comes at length to be considered as the sole proprietor*, and the people as labouring for his benefit. The proportion exacted as tax depends on the fertility of the soil, the extent of improvement, and the amount of the population. *The encroachments of the sovereign advance with the improvement of the society, and the peasant is ultimately left with no more than a bare subsistence.*"<sup>2</sup>

This was Oriental despotism in a nutshell. Paradoxically, the richness of soil caused in time the impoverishment of the people, and the only real benefactor was the sovereign. This was solely caused by a deviance, at least when compared to the situation in Europe, in the distribution power between the *political sphere*, or government, and the *primary productive forces* in the early (pre)history of man. This "deviance" had, furthermore, originated in the Indian Archipelago and was not introduced as a degenerative element by later conquerors from the Asiatic mainland.<sup>3</sup> The core of the argument thus seemed to anticipate vital elements in both Marx's concept of the *Asiatic Mode of Production*<sup>4</sup> and in K. Wittfogel's 20<sup>th</sup> century analysis of Oriental despotism.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Which, as mentioned, was perceived as a sort of living museum of Java's past. *Boon* 1990, pp.37-45.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.III, pp.46-47. My italics and underlining.

<sup>3</sup> Which, for instance Raffles tended to hint, as it will later be described.

<sup>4</sup> On Marx's analysis of the Asian societies as an instance of 'Orientalism', see *Said*, pp.153-156: "Marx's economic analyses are perfectly fitted thus to the standard Orientalist undertaking ". Or, as emphasised by G.S. Jones, when analysing Marx's ideas on Oriental despotism and the Asiatic Mode of Production: "In 1853, encouraged by Engels,

To make everything a bit more complicated, however, Crawford in HIA admitted that linguistic evidence could be interpreted as indicating a stronger influence from Hindu and Muslim forces on the development of an Oriental despotism in the region than suggested by himself earlier. The approach was based upon the ‘fact’ that: “in whatever country of the Archipelago *arbitrary government* exists, the titles of the prince, of his nobility, and of many of the offices of government, will generally be found purely Hindu; but in *federal associations*, their political institutions do not afford a vestige of the language of India”.<sup>2</sup> Hence it seemed probable that the governmental mode of “federal associations” was autochthonous to the original civilizations of the Indian Archipelago, whereas “the influence of Hindu and Mahomedan manners must, no doubt, have had considerable effect in forwarding the same object [i.e. that of despotism]”.<sup>3</sup> Then, how can the extent of this “considerable effect” be assessed? Does Crawford here contradict what he had earlier asserted in HIA, or can the two explanations co-exist, or could they even be merged into one consistent interpretation? Perhaps it would be beneficial to distinguish between *influence* and *cause* here. Although such a distinction does not appear explicitly in HIA, it certainly would be consistent with the general rationale of the book.

In concordance with the general string of argument in HIA it could be claimed that, on the one hand, the influence upon the region from the far more civilized, neighbouring states in India, and, on the other the development of an Oriental despotism as the prevailing mode of government, constituted two parallel, overlapping, and, indeed, in many manners interlocked processes, without, however, being each other’s cause and effect. This meant that, along with the general progression of society in a tropical and insular region like the Indian Archipelago, went both a development towards despotism and a growing communication with the bigger and more advanced states surrounding the region; these more advanced states were ruled by the principle and practice of despotism, and naturally these would have exerted a heavy influence on the embryonic despotisms of the Indian Archipelago without, however, causing the change in governmental mode as such. This could explain the *coincidence* between the diffusion of Indian words for despotism and the actual rule of despotism in the region, *without these Indians necessarily has caused the dissemination of despotism*. The question, however, is whether this was actually what Crawford claimed to tell in HIA, and we only have such circumstantial indications as those mentioned above.

---

Marx thought the unchanging character of Asia could be explained, firstly, by ‘leaving to central government the care of great public works’, especially irrigation, and secondly, a ‘village system’... By the late 1850s, however, he came to emphasise the absence of private property in land as the crucial feature.” (Jones 2007, p.196)

<sup>1</sup> Wittfogel does not seem to mention Crawford by name in his “Oriental Despotism”, and it must thus depend on further investigation to find out, whether he was acquainted with Crawford’s analysis, and in that case, influenced by it.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.25; my italics. “Arbitrary government” was here used as synonymous with *despotism*.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.III, pp.24-25.

HIA did not address the question of despotism vs. more ‘balanced’ modes of government in a comparative framework involving Europe explicitly, and this leaves us without any definite answer on what Crawford would have to say on this matter. However, something might be extrapolated from the above-mentioned binary between the “tame” but relatively rich agricultural nations of the east on the one hand and the powerful, wandering tribes on the other. The capacity of the nations belonging to the European civilization to advance on the stadial ladder of civilization, and indeed in Crawford’s time to constitute its undisputed vanguard, without necessarily having had to sacrifice the spirit of freedom was often explained by pointing to the convergence of the Roman principles and civilization with the “savage independence” of the Germanic tribes who inhabited the fringes of the Roman empire before its fall and decline. This had formed the grand theme of Gibbon’s famous opus magnum,<sup>1</sup> and also the Scottish historian W. Robertson addressed this question in new ways.<sup>2</sup> M. McLaren has demonstrated how the historical writings of the Scottish Enlightenment philosophers, and especially W. Robertson’s “The Progress of Society in Europe”, dealt with the development of the European state formations, and how they exerted a huge influence on Munro’s, Malcolm’s, and Elphinstone’s<sup>3</sup> descriptions of the Indian society and on their elaborations of just political principles and adequate administrative strategies for ruling the country.<sup>4</sup>

Robertson’s works, however, did not figure among the references in HIA: in the analysis of despotism and its origins, the footnotes instead abounded with references to and contestations of the ideas forwarded in A. von Humboldt’s “Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain” from 1811. In the comparisons with the despotism in India, HIA referred in particular to James Mill’s recently published “The History of British India” which was described as an “invaluable and great work”,<sup>5</sup> and in the discussions on the taxing of the land in the native states in the region HIA often alluded to the both writings of Adam Smith and to the recent publications by David Ricardo.<sup>6</sup>

### **3.4 Colonial Administration.**

While being stationed on Java during the British occupation 1811-16, Crawford seemed to have espoused roughly the same opinion as advanced in HIA regarding the essence and effects of the Oriental despotic mode of government on that island. This was illustrated by the content of a report

---

<sup>1</sup> The authoritative work on this field is of course J.G.A. Pocock’s multivolume “Barbarism and Religion” on the production of and contexts for Gibbon’s writings; in this context, see e.g. Vol.IV, pp.11-36.

<sup>2</sup> On the relations between Gibbon and Robertson and their mutual influences upon each other see *Pocock 2005*, pp.181-191.

<sup>3</sup> In his obituary on Crawford, R. Murchison listed Mountstuart Elphinstone as one of Crawford’s “intimate friends and correspondents.” (*Murchison 1868*, p.cxlix)

<sup>4</sup> *McLaren 2001*, p.128 & 172. “The Progress of Society in Europe” was originally published as an introduction to “History of the Reign of Charles V” from 1769.

<sup>5</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.52.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. HIA, Vol.III, pp.63 & 65.

Crawfurd sent to Crawfurd in May 1813,<sup>1</sup> bearing the title “Remarks on the nature and condition of landed tenures under the Native Government of Java, with some suggestions for the improvement of the land revenue in the territories of the European power”. Despite exhibiting a greater appreciation for the variations in the types of land ownership within Javanese society it was still maintained that: “from the facts already adduced regarding the state of landed tenures, it will have appeared that the *property right in the soil is unquestionably vested in the Sovereign*. This principle is so universally established and so frequently exercised that it is almost superfluous to offer any proof of it”.<sup>2</sup> In delineating the consequences of this pernicious system a certain agreement between this report and HIA can be detected as well; this system effectively ruled out any possibility of restraining the unlimited power of the Sovereign, since no alternative power basis could be established when *all* ownership rights to the soil ultimately befell upon the Sovereign.<sup>3</sup>

There was, however, a marked discrepancy between the discourse in this report and the one in HIA when it came to explaining the origins of this system. The report was altogether devoid of any allusions to the conjectured state of society in these regions in the earliest days, before the advent of recorded history. Instead, it was preoccupied with, at least partially, identifying the causes in circumstances belonging to a much more recent date: “much of this may no doubt be ascribed to the anarchy and disorder, which have been prevalent within the last 10 years; but independent of this, such maxims seem naturally to belong to that arbitrary spirit, which characterizes the political institutions of the Javanese”.<sup>4</sup> These political institutions consisted of a “Government which appears during this whole period to have prevailed was the same as now exists, viz. *a pure despotism*, in which no class of people possessed hereditary right or privilege, but were all depended on the will of a single person”.<sup>5</sup> But even when focussing on these more lasting aspects of the Javanese political society, and referring to “this whole period”, Crawfurd still did not go back beyond more than five or six centuries. In this report he seemed to have relied primarily on own observations and conversations with native princes and dignitaries regarding the present state of society and its newer history, whereas the historical analysis apparently was based solely on written, native source-

---

<sup>1</sup> This dating is established in *Bastin 1954b*, pp.118-119. Bastin, however, stressed that, in comparison to Crawfurd’s statements on undoubted despotism in his earlier reports of the Districts of Patjitan and Kedu (Pachitan and Cadoe) (*Bastin 1954b*, pp.95-102), Crawfurd had by now “modified his earlier opinion”, and “so far as the Javanese cultivator was concerned, the Bekel [‘Bakal’, Javanese title] was regarded as the ‘actual land-holder’.” (p.118) On the ‘land-holder’, or ‘Bakal’, Crawfurd wrote: “An interpretation of this term will go a great length towards explaining the nature of the office which *by no means implies a landholder in the sense which we understand that word*; a sense, indeed, in which it can have no existence in this part of the world.” (BL, Manuscripts Collection, Add.30353, p.68) And in their real conditions, Crawfurd assessed that in reality the ‘Bakals’ were “only very little above that of the cultivators”. (p.81)

<sup>2</sup> BL, Manuscripts Collection, Add.30353, pp.73-74 (my italics). The latter part of the sentence should probably be interpreted in the context of the intended readership of the report, viz. Other British officers stationed on Java.

<sup>3</sup> BL, Manuscripts Collection, Add.30353, p.74.

<sup>4</sup> BL, Manuscripts Collection, Add.30353, p.74.

<sup>5</sup> BL, Manuscripts Collection, Add.30353, p.76. My italics.



material.<sup>1</sup> So, although expounding roughly the same verdict upon contemporary Javanese society, the historical contextualization, the modes of explanation, and the evidence offered all differed widely in these two texts; this reflected a fundamental divergence on how best to approach and assess the state of society in the region, both in the past and in the present. The preconditions and implications of these contending approaches and their divergent appreciation of different types of source-material will be discussed in the following part when I discuss how Crawfurd and Raffles received and evaluated each other's books.

### **3.5 Adequate Spatializations, Authentic Explanations, and Authoritative Modes of Knowing.**

Crawfurd was not the only one, nor even the first, to write about the preponderance of Oriental despotism in the Indian Archipelago and its causes. Marsden and Raffles, Crawfurd's two predecessors in this region who wrote in a conjectural mode on the universal history of the region, had also touched upon this topic. Although neither of these appeared to have dealt with Oriental despotism in a systematic way, this approach nevertheless composed a pervasive trait in their analyses. After presenting Marsden's and especially Raffles' discourses on the existence of despotism in the Indian Archipelago, I will endeavour to contextualize the discrepancies between Raffles' and Crawfurd's interpretations and then delineate some of the historiographical principles along which they appear to have diverged.

#### **3.5.1 Raffles's on the Origin of Oriental Despotism in the Indian Archipelago.**

In his analysis of the modes of government in the Indian Archipelago, Crawfurd stated that the most primitive people in region only inhabited the most isolated mountain areas of the Malayan peninsula; invoking the displacement narrative, these peoples were forced into these remote corners by the ever ongoing pressure of the expansions of more advanced, agricultural societies. They belonged to the absolutely lowest stage of civilization imaginable: they were *not* sedentary, they were *unclad* or naked, they hunted by using poisoned arrows;<sup>2</sup> their mode of (*un*)governance was totally egalitarian, and, Crawfurd sceptically added, they did not seem to have any knowledge of the concept of property.<sup>3</sup> Such savages lived in a stage of utter stagnation, caught in an eternal *initial condition*; without any possibilities of advancement they were destined to be superseded by other,

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Add.30353 immediately preceding this report on the conditions of the native land tenures is another report written by "Mr. Crawfurd, Resident of Djojocarta" and entitled "A short sketch of the native History of Java."

<sup>2</sup> The mentioning of the use of poisoned weapons in either war or in hunting seems to have constituted an unmistakable topos of primitivism in the travel literature and early historiographies of Southeast Asia.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.5. This alleged fact appeared to have been so incredible that it textually was embedded in an ambiguous rhetoric which exempted Crawfurd from having to vouch for its authenticity by defining *property* very broadly: "and they have, *with respect to some descriptions of property*, a community of goods" (my italics).

more civilized societies who represented the progress.<sup>1</sup> This primitive, egalitarian form of existence,<sup>2</sup> such as it could be observed among some of these Sâman groups in the interior of Malaya,<sup>3</sup> was then extrapolated along the lines of conjectural history to encompass the *original* state of society in the Indian archipelago (and for that sake in the rest of the world): "this brings us to that early period of society, when, perhaps, *no form of social contract existed*".<sup>4</sup> The concept of private property was also in Marsden's HS associated with progression in civilization:

"It would seem then to be a *natural step* in the advances from anarchy to settled government, and that it *could only take place* in such societies as have already a strong idea of the value of personal property."<sup>5</sup>

This suggests that for Marsden the concept of private property both expressed a *natural* element in- and it constituted a necessary precondition for the establishment of any viable form of government; this latter element was considered to be as well a mover as a criterion of civilization. Similar approaches can be found in Raffles's writings on the importance of the concept of property for the development of civilization. These conditions regarding civil society and property rights were extrapolated to count as well in both the indigenous and the Dutch ruled parts of the Indian Archipelago in what appeared to be Raffles's own time. These discourses thus both entailed and generated some explicit ideological ideas and political connotations.<sup>6</sup> The allegedly amoral and avaricious monopoly of the Dutch and their consistent disrespect towards the sanctity of private property was in this manner discursively paired with an Oriental despotism in which all property rights (incl. those to one's own body) were subjected to the capricious will of an almighty ruler. In Raffles' HJ it was thus argued that the Oriental despotism represented an alien element in the Indian Archipelago; the rights to private property had *originally* been a *natural* element in the civilizations of the Indian Archipelago – and this apparently regardless whether this *originality* was perceived to be composed of the very first *Polynesian civilizations* or of the later Hindu (and Buddhist) civilizations that once reigned on Java. Raffles assumed in HJ that in this region, like in the rest of the world, the soil and its yields had "by nature" originally belonged to those who first cultivated

---

<sup>1</sup> In his description of the original people of Borneo, the *Dyaks*, G.W. Earl took a similar approach: "Under such circumstances, improvement is perfectly impracticable; they have in all probability existed in their present state during the lapse of ages, and without foreign intercourse must continue in the same condition forever." (*Earl 1837*, p.255).

<sup>2</sup> In his later writings, Crawford's depreciation for this *savage egalitarianism* became unequivocally articulated; in 1861 he wrote: "I cannot see much value on the freedom of the being who was liable to be knocked on the head by the first stronger man he met, just for the sake of the impression of a dead rat or a cocoa-nut". (*Crawford 1861a*, p.159).

<sup>3</sup> The extremely meagre conditions enjoyed by these *eastern Negroes* were not, however, at any time explained by recourse to racial factors. As such, this part of Crawford's discourse seems to corroborate my argument advanced in Part I, chapter 3.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.III, p.23. My italics. Again, as in the question of the possible absence of an idea of property, the question of the existence of a "pre-contractual society" is coined in rather vague terms that express uncertainty and ambiguity.

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1811*, p.248; the italics are mine.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. *Knapman 2006*, pp.26-29 & 32-33.

it.<sup>1</sup> This assertion on the assumed original state of affairs was emphasized by drawing an analogy to the present conditions amongst the people inhabiting the more inaccessible mountains of the Sunda region in Java:<sup>2</sup>

“The land tenures of the *Súnda* districts, *according to this hypothesis*, are only wrecks of the general system, which have been protected against encroachment, because they did not so powerfully invite rapacity. Whatever the truth there may be in this opinion, *the fact is undoubted*, that in the mountainous and less fertile districts of Java, and in the island of *Báli*, where the Mahometan sway has not yet extended, *individual propriety right in the soil* is fully established, while in that portion of Java where the Mahometan rule has been most felt, and where propriety right amounts to the greatest value, it vests almost exclusively in the sovereign.”<sup>3</sup>

The right to private property hence seemed to have been an original trait of the civilizations in these regions, and it had only been ruled out by “the introduction of the Mahometan system and the encroachments of despotic sovereigns”.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, in a recent study, S.M.K. Aljunied has emphasised how Raffles not only concluded that “Islamic rule had brought about state ownership of the land, which eliminated any independent property”, but also that “such inequitable social structure was, to him, absent in other Hindu-Buddhist societies in the Malay World, where individual property of land was recognized and protected”.<sup>5</sup> At the root of this malady lay the “Mahometan system” which had only been introduced to the Indian Archipelago in the course of the 15<sup>th</sup> century; by eradicating the private property rights in the land, a prime mover and essential indicator of advanced civilization, Islam thus represented a *degenerative* and foreign force of influence in the Indian Archipelago. Even though this religion had been spread peacefully, through trade relations rather than by spectacular conquest as in India,<sup>6</sup> it was still described as being an *intruder*;<sup>7</sup> in HJ this was to some extent facilitated by implicitly singling out the Indian Archipelago from the Asiatic mainland and then defining it as, in terms of human geography, an autonomous

---

<sup>1</sup> *Raffles 1817*, Vol.I, p.139.

<sup>2</sup> See also *Roberts 1999*, p.69, for a similar approach with regard to the ‘original’ religion in Java.

<sup>3</sup> *Raffles 1817*, Vol.I, p.139; the italics are mine, except those referring to names of regions.

<sup>4</sup> It was also a moot point in Indian historiography then whether the Muslims had introduced despotism to the Indian subcontinent, or this mode of government was practiced by the Hindus before the Muslim invasions; the propagators of what Trautmann calls ‘indomania’ most often claimed the former stance, whereas the so-called ‘indophobes’ (esp. the Scots C. Grant and J. Mill) stock to the latter interpretation. (Trautmann, 1997/2004, pp.103-104). McLaren, on the other hand, shows that the Scottish ‘conjectural history’ usually attributed a distinct despotic element in the Islamic religion: “by endorsing domestic tyranny [i.e. a systematic suppression of the female part of the population] it fostered and entrenched political tyranny, and by glorifying proselytization and conversion by the sword it sanctified violence and oppression” (*McLaren 2001*, p.166). For a recent discussion of Raffles’ ideas on Islam’s role in the introduction of despotism to Java, see *Aljunied 2005*, pp.29-30; in general his conclusions are similar to mine.

<sup>5</sup> *Aljunied 2005*, p.36.

<sup>6</sup> *Raffles 1817*, Vol.II, pp.1-5. HIA, Vol.II, pp.259-271. See also *Aljunied 2005*, pp.20-21.

<sup>7</sup> See also *Aljunied 2003*, pp.25-26.

unity – in particular defined by its glorious and special Hindu-Buddhist past. Thus it could be assessed, with recourse to ancient history, that in the Indian Archipelago the rule of Islam not only caused stagnation by its negation of the rights to hold private property, but it even proved to be degenerative by subduing the former existence of this most important element of civilization; furthermore, these regimes held no legitimacy in the eyes of the British since they, again on the basis on a scholarly argumentation, were proved to be nothing but intruding and foreign elements, and as such they did not represent the ‘true’ and original traditions of the region.

Whereas Muslim rulers allegedly had introduced despotism to Java and most of the Indian Archipelago, the Dutch colonial regime was accused of continuing this system without doing anything to eradicate it. Even worse they had placed themselves on the top of this despotic system, as making up just another exploitative layer requisitioning taxes and revenues and threading property rights under foot.<sup>1</sup>

### **3.5.2 The “Raffles-Crawfurd Controversy”: Claiming Authority & Authenticity.**

Compared to the Indian subcontinent, the Indian Archipelago and the rest of Southeast Asia were geographically and historiographically a *terrae incognitae*; it was still a region enveloped in an oriental shroud of mysticism rather than revealed by more meticulous and scholarly descriptions. In spite of being the age of scientific exploration, this was still a region rife with potential for creating rather than discovering the wonders of the East, as illustrated by the hoax of “Princess Caraboo” – a poor servant named Mary Baker who in 1817 took the identity of a princess from the island of ‘Javasu’ shipwrecked in England; for a short while she became quite a celebrity until finally revealed. In 1817 Raffles had published his “History of Java”, and the “Caraboo hoax” attested to the craze for the East Indies which this book produced; even more important here was, as D. Lee pointed out, that “in fact, the central irony of the Caraboo case is that she pulled off her imposture through the scientific and ethnographic fantasy about how true identity was determined”.<sup>2</sup>

The central problem associated with describing far away places and spaces was that of credibility. As Beeckman in the introduction to his “Voyage to Borneo” from 1718 mentioned: “It is a common Saying, and indeed generally proves true, That Old Men and Travellers do give themselves great Liberty in relating fictitious and improbable Stories: The Distance of Time being as great a Protection to the former as that of Place is to the latter.”<sup>3</sup> Although travel literature composed an important part of the source-material used by universal and conjectural historians, it was by no means ingenuously taken at face value: it was widely acknowledged that there was a fine

---

<sup>1</sup> For discussion of Raffles’ use of Dutch sources on Java, both for obtaining information and in his rhetorical opposition to the former misrule of the Dutch, see *Kheng*, pp.248-249 and *Goh*, pp.326-329.

<sup>2</sup> *Lee*, p.284.

<sup>3</sup> *Beeckman*, “To The Reader”, pp.i-ii.

line between false, fictive, and authentic travel literature, and that these types often intermingled within the same work.<sup>1</sup>

If the content of the text could not be directly authenticated by the reader, then its purported authenticity had to rely on the reliability of the author of the text. That is, a recourse to authority as the provider of authenticity. In his “History of Sumatra”, W. Marsden stated that:

“Its [his own text on Sumatra] authenticity remains unimpeachable. This last quality is that which I can with the most confidence take upon me to vouch for. The greatest portion of what I have described, has fallen within the scope of my own immediate observation; the remainder is either matter of common notoriety to every person residing in the island, or received upon the concurring authority of *gentlemen*, whose situation in the *East India Company’s service*, long acquaintance with the natives, extensive knowledge of their languages, ideas, and manners, and *respectability of character*, render them worthy of the most implicit faith that can be given to human testimony.”<sup>2</sup>

Note here especially the italicised parts that indicate the time-bounded reflections on the socio-cultural criteria for those whose statements the reader ought not to distrust. Just like S. Shapin has argued in the case of the 17<sup>th</sup> century English Scientific community,<sup>3</sup> the reliability of travel literature in the 18<sup>th</sup> and early nineteenth century seemed to have become increasingly dependent on the author’s social authority. G. Beer thus spoke of a “social contract between narrator and readers” which combined the “social and intellectual claims to authority”, and this became epitomized in the notion of the *gentlemanly traveller*.<sup>4</sup> Speaking from a position of authority did not necessarily imply that everybody agreed on what was said, though; divergent interpretations and evaluations could, and did, still occur, as the discrepancies in Raffles’s and Crawford’s ideas on Oriental despotism and its causes in the Indian Archipelago amply testified. But in such cases the arguments invoked in these debates were usually not *directly* libellous, at least not if he was supposed to belong to the distinguished category of the gentleman. Yet this did not prevent that the argumentum ad hominem still flourished, albeit it was often in more indirect and suggestive forms.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This distinction between false, fictive, and authentic travel books is borrowed from *Stagl 1995*, pp.199-200. *Adams 1980* contains a wide range of examples of different types of fake or “decorated” travel literature.

<sup>2</sup> *Marsden 1811*, p.vi. The italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> One of the main themes in *Shapin* was to show how “this new culture [of English experimental philosophy] emerged partly through the purposeful relocation of the conventions, codes, and values of gentlemanly conversation into the domain of natural philosophy”. (*Shapin*, p.xvii). pp.243-247 dealt with “Traveler’s Tales”.

<sup>4</sup> *Beer*, pp.56 & 58.

<sup>5</sup> This did not detain Raffles and Sir John Barrow, in their review of Crawford’s HIA, from hinting that he exhibited such a cavalier attitude in his lack of references that it virtually bordered on plagiarism. However, this never transmuted into directly outspoken accusations; instead, it was ironically suggested that “he should have been more particular in distinguishing between that which he borrowed, and that which we are to consider original”, and “we did not, therefore, expect to find this adduced as a new and original remark, in opposition to an idea which never existed but in the author’s imagination”. (*Raffles & Barrow*, pp.125 & 115)

If the question of authenticity of the text depended on the authority of its author, then the opposite also seems to have been the case: that an author could gain authority in a field, if he produced what was considered an authentic representation of this field. Travel accounts and historical narratives were not only produced in view of promoting the knowledge of the region but also with the intent of promoting one's own career. M. McLaren has amply shown how this worked in an Indian setting,<sup>1</sup> and there is no reason to doubt that this was not the case in the Indian Archipelago too. Publishing historical and/or scientific books on the Indian Archipelago, and hence establishing a reputation of being an authority on this field, could be an efficient way of gaining the attention of the one's superiors. If perceived as instruments within a larger career-building technique, then both Raffles's and Crawfurd's books and the subsequent reviews of these might be interpreted as constituting parts of a consistent strategy of advancing oneself and keeping potential competitors at bay. In a private letter Raffles himself mentioned the uneasy, yet not directly unfriendly, relationship to Crawfurd: "As for Crawfurd ... but you mistake me if you suppose I entertain any unpleasant feeling on his account, whatever his faults, he is devoting his mind exclusively to objects in which my heart and soul are deeply interested ... Two of a trade, they say, can never agree and Crawfurd and I are, perhaps running too much on the same parallel, not now and then to be jostling each other."<sup>2</sup> Such a strategy would include both a *defensive* element of legitimising the political decisions taken in the past and a more *proactive* one of carving out a future ideology and advancing the political steps that such an ideology facilitated.<sup>3</sup> Both elements could be detected in HJ, in HIA, as well as in the reviews of these two books.

Crawfurd wrote his review of Raffles's HJ in *Edinburgh Review* in 1819, i.e. only one year before publishing his own HIA. It would indeed be surprising, if he did not, at least partially, have this in mind when he assessed the qualities and deficiencies of Raffles' work.<sup>4</sup> He thus began by

---

<sup>1</sup> McLaren stresses how "much of their research, although not all in the case of Munro, was done as a means to an end, not as an end itself", and "their writings were all overtly political in character". (McLaren 2001, p.231)

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Raffles, dated Bencoolen July 25, 1822, recipient not stated. Reprinted in *Raffles 1835*, Vol.II, pp.221-228 (quote from p.223). See also *Quilty 1998*, p.v. Two years earlier, right before the publication of HIA Raffles wrote to Marsden: "I am looking forward with anxiety for Crawfurd's work: from the time he has taken to arrange and polish, I feel no doubt of its value. I expect from him a somewhat new view of the literature, history, and antiquities of Java, as he appears in his review of my work in the *Edinburgh* to have thrown a cloud over that part of my history. I shall be happy to stand corrected where I am wrong, and to acknowledge my error; but I hope he will give something more than assertion to the dates which he disputed." (*Raffles 1835*, Vol.II, pp.82-88, quote from p.83)

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. McLaren 2001, p.241.

<sup>4</sup> The following could be read in *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and Its Dependencies*, Vol.VI (Jun.-Dec. 1818), p.76, concerning books in the press: "A Description of the Islands of Java, Bali, and Celebes; With an Account Civil, Political, Commercial, and Historical, of the Principal Nations and Tribes of the Indian Archipelago. By John Crawfurd, Esq. Late Resident at the Court of the Sultan of Java. In 3 Vols., 8vo, with illustrative Maps and Engravings". Given that these data actually complies perfectly with the book that was actually published in 1820, it seems that already in 1818 Crawfurd had progressed far in the process of writing and publishing the book. That the allusions to Java, Bali, and Celebes was left out of the title of the printed book could perhaps best be explained by a wish not to let the title be too similar to Raffles' *History of Java*, published in 1817. Later, most of the critique of Crawfurd's book was directed towards the fact that, despite its broad title, it dealt mostly with Java; and on that subject

commending Raffles for opening up a new, interesting field of research through his “very valuable work; which presents, to the British reader at least, the only authentic and detailed account of a land of eminent fertility and happy situation inhabited by an interesting race of people, hardly fewer than five millions in number; and whose history, it is now discovered, chiefly by the industry of our countrymen, is connected with that of the three great civilized nations of continental Asia – the Hindus, the Chinese, and the Arabs.”<sup>1</sup> Then he continued by presenting the main content, and he ended the review by pointing out the flaws in Raffles’ HJ. What concern us here are 1) the fact that Crawford’s treatment of the topic of “Government” in HJ reflected his own opinion much more than that of Raffles, and 2) his critique of Raffles’ historiographical methodology implicitly revealed, as well as underpinned, his own approach. After quoting Raffles at length he subsequently offered the following “interpretation” of this part:

Of the Oriental Archipelago, indeed, we may observe, that civilization and despotism seem to go hand in hand. Each tribe has a government, despotic in proportion as it is improved; and the scale may be traced from the naked Negro tribes, who acknowledge no leaders, to the Javanese, who present a fine picture of unlimited despotism. Had we no other guides than the languages of the different tribes, these would afford ample testimony of the fact.<sup>2</sup>

This was indeed, if anything, unequivocally an anticipation of both the interpretation and the theoretical approach that Crawford was to present in HIA in the following year. In his assessment of the historical part of Raffles’ work,<sup>3</sup> Crawford began by stating that: “The too ample details [of “the civil history of the Javanese”] into which Sir Stamford Raffles has entered on this subject, are indeed, in our opinion, among the greatest blemishes of his work”, and, after presenting a very brief sketch of the main event in this civil history, he concluded by stating that “This is probably as much of the history of Java, as can interest the popular or general reader.”<sup>4</sup> This last remark referred to a relevancy criterion determined, at least partially, by popularity, and which was preponderant within the Scottish historiographical tradition.<sup>5</sup>

---

Raffles’ work already existed. See e.g. p.146 in the review in *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register*, Vol.X (July-Dec., 1820, pp.145-152). The Edinburgh based journal *The Edinburgh Magazine*, on the other hand praised the work in unequivocal terms and lauded Crawford by placing his contributions to the enhanced knowledge of the East in the same class as Sir William Jones himself (p.26). Interestingly enough, the *Edinburgh Review* did not contain any review of this work; perhaps due to the fact that person who seems to have been their expert in this field, that is Crawford himself, was both absent, on his route to India and then to Siam and Cochin China on a diplomatic mission, and, of course, rather disqualified in reviewing this work, given that he was the author of it.

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1819, p.395.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1819, p.400.

<sup>3</sup> Despite their titles both Raffles’s and Crawford’s books embraced much more than what is nowadays considered history – for instance aspects of natural history. *History* referred to the epistemological level of description rather than to specific temporality in the approach. (Trautmann 1997/2004, p.60, and Aarsleff 1967/1983, pp.127-128).

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1819, pp.409 & 410.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. McLaren 2001, p.128.

The review of HIA that appeared in Quarterly Review in 1822, two years after its publication, was kept in much more dismissive mood;<sup>1</sup> it was most likely written by Raffles and Sir John Barrow in company.<sup>2</sup> Having originally participated in Macartney's failed Embassy to China, Barrow had in 1803 obtained a post as permanent secretary at the Admiralty, a post he held right up to his death in 1848. Barrow exerted a huge influence on the British knowledge production on the geography, history, and customs of the far away and little known countries, both as a main instigator of many exploring expeditions in his official position, and as one of the most prolific contributors to the influential periodical Quarterly review.<sup>3</sup> It was founded in 1809 by J. Murray as a more conservative alternative that explicitly intended to counter the impact of the ideas posed in liberal and reformist Edinburgh Review.

The review more than hinted that HIA did not contribute with anything new that had not already been described in Raffles's HJ or in other, earlier publications. Apart from a detailed critique of some more specific aspects of HIA's content and the allegations of plagiarism, the most vehement criticism was especially directed towards Crawford's theoretical approach and methodological procedures. Thus they began their review with a fierce diatribe against what they saw as: "not a plain narrative or detail of facts, but consists rather of a series of disquisitions, in which the author advances a number of ingenious theories and speculations, while the reader is seldom furnished with such a full and impartial statement as to enable him to form his own judgement. In works of an historical nature such speculations can rarely be indulged without derogating from that character of impartiality and authenticity by which they should always be distinguished."<sup>4</sup> The core of these deficiencies was then located to the theoretical approach in HIA:

"We have frequently had occasion to lament the propensity to proceed too precipitately to *generalize from insufficient data*, and to *speculate upon small number of facts, before they are substantiated*. This practice (borrowed from the French) has been lately but too prevalent among the higher class of *philosophical travellers*, and must be condemned even in them as adverse to the cause of truth and science: but when writers of less eminence who profess to give accounts, from their own observation, of distant countries, adopt this error, and departing from the plain statement of facts which is their proper province, boldly launch upon an ocean of speculation, we cannot refrain from reprobating this *pseudo-philosophical* spirit, and deploring the loss of the plain unvarnished narratives of our earlier voyagers. The

---

<sup>1</sup> On the homepage of the "Quarterly Review Archive" ([www.rc.umd.edu/reference/qv/index/55.html](http://www.rc.umd.edu/reference/qv/index/55.html)), various circumstantial evidence is provided in favour of Raffles and Barrow both being authors of the review.

<sup>2</sup> On Barrow and his importance in the British context of exploration and imperialism during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., see Lloyd, Fleming, and the entry on Barrow in ODNB (Cameron).

<sup>3</sup> According to F. Fleming Barrow in all wrote 195 reviews in the QR. (Fleming, p.8) Besides his time consuming job and indefatigable participation in the meetings of the learned societies, he also wrote 17 books (ODNB, Cameron).

<sup>4</sup> Raffles & Barrow, p.112.



character of a compiler, and an original observer are seldom happily combined in the same person; but when to this is superadded *a fondness for theory and speculation*, we cannot but receive with caution what comes to us under so questionable a shape.”<sup>1</sup>

Although this criticism did not explicitly encompass any description of Oriental despotism, it nevertheless implied that the very basis of Crawford’s analysis was disputed; this obviously affected the validity of Crawford’s discourse on Oriental despotism. In the following, I will try to demonstrate how this discrepancy between Raffles’s and Crawford’s ideas on Oriental despotism can be interpreted, not only as a manifestation of a struggle for authority within the context of competing career strategies, but also as a result of two contesting historiographical frameworks, each replete with their own theories and methodologies.

### 3.5.3 Conjectural History and Orientalism: Discrepancies and Overlapping.

The quotation above illustrates in unequivocal terms that Crawford’s explanation of Oriental despotism did not appear convincing to these reviewers. It seemed not only to have been a question of Crawford’s book lacking methodological rigour, as allegedly evinced by a tendency to “generalize from insufficient data”; rather, the malady was inherently located in the approach *per se*: in the what they denominated as a “pseudo-philosophical spirit” and its predilection towards “theory and speculation”.<sup>2</sup> Or, in other words, in conjunction with criticising Crawford’s alleged carelessness they also assailed the very concept of conjectural history itself. This contestation included both the type of evidence offered in the shape of the historical *fact*, the argumentative modes of inference, and the historical subject area associated with these.

The main reason for discarding Crawford’s results was primarily articulated through a rhetoric focussing on a rejection of the purported *historical facts* in HIA and the way they were presented as evidence: “we must observe that we find nothing in these lubrications to induce us to depart from the received opinions and inferences arising out of simple facts”<sup>3</sup>, and “its principal defect is that which we have already pointed out as the prevailing foible of the age, namely, a rage for generalizing on partial and sufficient data, and the substitution of bold speculation for the patient investigation of facts.”<sup>4</sup> But these *facts* could not be assessed as such without relating them to the larger discourse in which they were inscribed. Or, in the words of H. White: “what is at issue here is

---

<sup>1</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, p.112. My italics.

<sup>2</sup> A similar criticism was made by the anonymous reviewer of HIA in *The British Review* already in 1820; despite a generally positive appraisal of the book, he especially lamented how this approach stylistically resulted in an “endless classification” (p.327) and “endless divisions and distributions, which deform his writings” (p.345).

<sup>3</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, p.121.

<sup>4</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, p.122.

not, What are the facts? but rather, how are the facts to be described in order to sanction one mode of explaining them rather than another?”<sup>1</sup>

This discrepancy between Crawford and Raffles (and Barrow) in determining the *historical facts* and assessing their validity as *evidence* did, in my opinion, reveal two different, and at some points opposing, modes of explanation. Raffles and Barrow situated themselves discursively by a opposition towards the kind of conjectural history practiced by Crawford;<sup>2</sup> this was most apparent in their critique of HIA’s historiographical approach.

“On the historical part of this work, we are compelled to observe, that however well it may be calculated to support the author’s theoretical notions, it is in many respects incomplete. The idea of throwing aside all traditionary accounts as unworthy of notice, and particularly of a country whose early civilization is, according to our author, ‘one of the very few facts, that carry back the history of our species to a great antiquity’, is straining the point rather too far, and we really do not see why the dates, expressed in words or letters, should be rejected, while they are admitted in every other part of India.”<sup>3</sup>

The major aspect here was the reproach of Crawford for failing to include the native historical accounts as source-material; it was exactly in this aspects that conjectural history and Orientalism differed on the methodological level. One simple definition of Orientalism in this historical context could be to let this term “refer mainly to the attitudes of [Sir William] Jones, ... Jones firmly believed a historical narrative could be recovered from Indian legendary and mythological material”.<sup>4</sup> Methodologically this implied an extensive use of oriental source-material in the shape of books and other types of written relics (antiquities), and it was believed that the *true* historical facts could be extracted from the *content* of these texts, when they were submitted to the methods of critical philology. In terms of theory, this facilitated the construction of a reliable historical *narrative* of the main historical events of the area in question. Something, which was neither possible, nor desired in conjectural history; this mainly entailed a *description* of the sequential hierarchy of the structures of society at different civilizational stages. In legitimating their own approach, recourse was made to what they presented as the normal historiographical practice “in every other part of India”. Clearly, it was a “Jonesian” Orientalism they referred to here; what they failed to mention, however, was any references to James Mill’s “History of British India” which, in

---

<sup>1</sup> White 1978, p.134. From a discussion on Darwin’s use, and rhetorical invocation, of *facts* in his discourse on nature, contained in the essay “Fictions of Factual Representation”.

<sup>2</sup> Hereby I do not intend to state that no instances of argumentation based on a sort of conjectural history can be found in HJ; but this type of argumentation seemed to have been constrained primarily to the methodological level, and later the *results* were primarily inscribed in another theoretical framework, namely that of Orientalism.

<sup>3</sup> Raffles & Barrow, p.126.

<sup>4</sup> Majeed 1990, p.209. Such a definition would constitute a subset of what Trautmann calls *Orientalism 1*. (Trautmann 1997/2004, esp. pp.23-25)

its staunch utilitarianism, not only made an extensive use of arguments drawn from conjectural history, but also denied all validity and quality of written, oriental source-material.

In his review of HJ, Crawford once more articulated his stance on the quality of the literature in this region, and more generally on the relationship between the (stage of) civilization and its literature: “the literature of Java, with exceptions too inconsiderable to deserve notice, is all poetical, or rather metrical. This is *an incontestable proof of barbarism*. People write for amusement, before they write for utility or instruction. It is only when they have something of intrinsic importance to tell, that they have recourse to sober prose.”<sup>1</sup> This obviously implied that such literature would be of little use in producing an authentic and convincing account of the historical events and structures in the region.

### **3.6 Diplomacy and Oriental despotism.**

The widely disseminated accounts of the Macartney embassy to China in 1796 had left an inedible impression of a stagnant society, petrified in its insistence on cumbersome ceremonies, void formalities, and on upholding the image of a societal structure that did not in any way correspond with the realities – at least in the way that the contemporary British saw them.<sup>2</sup> Especially the contested matter of the ceremonial nine prostrations before the Emperor, the so-called *kow-tow*, gave rise to numerous diplomatic complications; in British discourses it came to epitomize the Chinese conceitedness and the reluctance of the Asiatic despots to face the obvious realities of power politics. If anything, the unsuccessful Amherst embassy to China in 1816 only succeeded in solidifying this image of China.<sup>3</sup>

Sir H. Ellis participated in this embassy as Third Commissioner, and afterwards, in 1817, he published his *Journal of the Proceedings of this Embassy*;<sup>4</sup> this was reviewed the year after in the *Edinburgh Review* by Crawford.<sup>5</sup> Although chiefly occupied with the trials and tribulations associated with the Chinese trade, Crawford nonetheless found space to dedicate some thoughts on how to deal with the governments of Eastern nations in the most apt and just manner. In regard to the custom of *kow-tow* Crawford here adhered strictly to the principle of “when in Rome...”, and he stressed that “when an ambassador goes to a foreign court, it really seems to us but reasonable to suppose that he shall conform to the ceremony of that court with respect to ambassadors, and not

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1819, p.404. My italics. A similar interpretation was adduced in Crawford 1834a, p.412.

<sup>2</sup> Sir John Barrow had in 1804 published the account of his “Travels in China” on his experiences in this Embassy and which two years later was followed by “A Voyage to Cochin China in the Years 1792 and 1793.”

<sup>3</sup> Lord Amherst later became the Governor-General of India, and it was he who appointed Crawford as the head of the diplomatic mission to Ava 1826-1827.

<sup>4</sup> Ellis, H.: *Journal of the Proceedings of the Late Embassy to China* (2 vols.), London 1817.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1818.

attempt to prescribe a new one.”<sup>1</sup> In the case of the Amherst Embassy, he spoke frankly about the “ridiculous discussions respecting the Ku-tou [kow-tow]” and how this ultimately had resulted in the failure of the embassy.<sup>2</sup> Thus spake Crawford the author, and, although still only in its embryonic state, his ideological criticism was evident in the discernment of the maladies inherent in the mixing of administrative exigency, diplomatic power, and trading monopoly of within one single body of his own employer, the EIC.

However, three years later Crawford himself embarked as the head of an embassy to Siam and Cochin China, and in 1826-1827 he was to repeat that function in the Embassy to Ava. It is interesting to see how his discourse on the importance of ceremonial rituals altered, and how this was accompanied by a similar change in tenor when describing the foreign policy conducted by these nations: this went from constituting a plausible and predictable response to European aggression and bellicosity to incarnate yet another instance of the intolerable obstinacy associated with Oriental despotism. In 1818 Crawford had explained the rationale behind the Chinese attitude towards Europeans:

“We [the Europeans at large, incl. the British] have played the game of war and ambition, for near three hundred years, in their immediate vicinity; and most of us have, at one period or another, committed hostilities upon themselves. We have always professed, indeed, the greatest regard to justice and national independence: – but in truth it was scarcely to be expected, that those who have watched the progress of our Indian empire, should give implicit faith to those professions. The Chinese are a practical, and not a very credulous people, and seem to be guided almost entirely by experience in the measures as they have adopted as to European nations. ... The same course, indeed, has been adopted by all the neighbouring countries, Japan, Cochin, Siam, and others. Wherever, in a word, the native governments possessed vigour, the intercourse with Europeans had either been placed under jealous restrictions, or altogether interdicted.”<sup>3</sup>

Whereas this reluctance in 1818 had been a sign of vigour and national strength, it had by the time when Crawford himself headed the diplomatic missions become an indication of the political myopia of these regimes: while negotiating with the Siamese government officials, their insistence on following their own ways had by now become “a striking example of the singular and

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawford 1818*, p.437.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1818*, p.438. It was not only the British who faced this problem of kow-tow; Crawford also referred to the failed Russian embassy in 1806 which had to return even before entering China proper due to their refusal to submit to this rite (*Crawford 1818*, p.437) – they denied to kow-tow before an effigy of the emperor in Urga (present Ulan Bator). For an interesting account of the travels and tribulations of this embassy, see the correspondence which the head of the ‘intelligence department’ of the expedition, the famous traveller and author J. Potocki, had with his superior, the Russian Foreign Secretary A. Czartoryski.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawford 1818*, pp.433-434.

extravagant national vanity of the Siamese. This people, of half-naked and enslaved barbarians, have the hardihood to consider themselves the first nation in the world, and to view the performance of any servile office to a stranger, as an act of degradation.”<sup>1</sup> Here he insisted on the importance of not necessarily complying with the ceremonial proceedings prescribed by the Asian state; this was especially manifested in the contested question whether Crawford, as an envoy of the Governor-General of India who was himself a subject to the King of Great Britain, should be acknowledged as a representative of a nation on par with the independent nation of Siam, or whether he merely should be received by lower government officials as an representative of merely a small region of another country. This reluctance of both the Siamese and Cochin Chinese governments to accept British India as an Asian power in its own right thus came in Crawford’s discourse to be a certain sign of their backwardness, and recourse to the trope of Oriental despotism was taken when explaining the factors that led to this flagrant overestimation of own might and denial of their “real” position in the world.<sup>2</sup>

In the end Crawford did not prevail in this diplomatic struggle, and he did not manage to conduct his negotiations on the highest level; as such, invoking the trope of oriental despotism can be interpreted as an attempt, not as much at *explaining* the structures of the Siamese and Cochin Chinese societies, as at *explaining away* his own diplomatic failure. As such, the trope of Oriental despotism here appears to have served a deliberate, instrumentalist purpose, rather than constituting a prefiguring, epistemological framework within which the analytical approach to these countries and their inhabitants was framed. This impression seems to be further corroborated by the fact that Crawford had earlier, when not himself deeply enmeshed in the diplomatic complexities and not entrusted with a set of instructions that had to be complied with, perceived the very same elements as emblematic of a perfectly plausible and rational behaviour.

### **3.7 Conclusion.**

Oriental despotism played a vital part in the British early 19<sup>th</sup> C. discourses on India and Southeast Asia. In the case of Crawford this was particularly evident, and this was reflected in the reports that were written while being employed as a colonial administrator, in his historical works, his travelogues, and his review articles. Drawing upon a set of commonly held notions and modes of expression, the trope of Oriental despotism was well known, widely disseminated, and somewhat codified in its approaches and phraseology; when inscribed into the referential framework of conjectural history it became even more so. Here the entangled relationship between the prevalent governmental mode amongst the most advanced societies in the region and the negation of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1828a, p.88.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Crawford 1828a, pp.80, 101-102, & 247.

concept of private property stood out as the most glaring and important consequences of Oriental despotism.

Within the colonial discourses on the history and present state of the indigenous and/or Dutch ruled states in Southeast Asia neither the presence of Oriental despotism nor its malevolent influence were deemed in need of any explanation. These aspects were naturalized in the British discourses on the Indian Archipelago and tacitly assumed constitutive for the general approach and assessment of these societies; H. White stated “that historians *constitute* their subjects as possible objects of narrative representation by the very language they use to *describe* them”,<sup>1</sup> and as such the influence of Oriental despotism not only pervaded these texts but it also prefigured the inquisitive gaze that provided the *data* which later was interpreted and inscribed into the discourse.

Yet, even though the prefiguring structure of these discourses may have predisposed a certain proclivity towards seeing the traces and corollaries of Oriental despotism almost everywhere, this did not imply that the authors were deprived of all agency and enslaved by discourse. On the contrary, the notion of Oriental despotism could be actively invoked in the discourse to suit some immediate political or personal purpose. However, even if oriental despotism could be interpreted and discursively used in different ways, it seemed much more difficult to do away with it altogether.

Although largely operating within the same referential framework of conjectural history, supplemented with Orientalist theories and methodologies, Crawfurd’s and Raffles’s interpretations posed some important differences: differences that probably might be best illustrated through the discrepancy between the two regarding how to determine and identify reliable historical evidence. Both Crawfurd and Raffles included all types of source-material in their historiographical analyses, but they differed decisively in the distribution of the credibility and the applicability attributed to them; this undoubtedly influenced their interpretations, and in was on the basis of such historical interpretations that an appraisal of the current stage of civilization in the area was provided. These historical interpretations thus carved out the epistemological template upon which the ideological stance and the political decision making process were subsequently legitimated.

And the other way round. As mentioned before, both personal interests and political convictions played their part in framing of the historiographical interpretations too. Giving the impression of being an expert on the history of a given region, and thus being able to provide a reliable contextualization of its current political situation, was often used a career-building strategy by the employees of the East India Company. Both Crawfurd and Raffles advocated a permanent British occupation of the Indian Archipelago as the surest way to secure the eradication of Oriental

---

<sup>1</sup> White 1978, p.95; the italics are White’s. (From the essay “Historical Text as Literary Artifact”)

despotism in the region and the introduction of free trade and the establishment of a civil society;<sup>1</sup> their historiographical rationale for advancing this view, however, differed. So, albeit in the end evincing similar ideological inclinations, these inclinations were nevertheless placed within each their different historiographical discourse.<sup>2</sup>

Oriental despotism was not solely invoked as a historiographical concept by Crawford; it also composed a crucial component in his descriptions of the contemporary Asian societies that could be read in his travelogues. Here the existence of Oriental despotism was seemingly corroborated through *direct observation* of its consequences upon the society and its inhabitants; such observations could, however, only confirm the prevalence of Oriental despotism, if they were firmly embedded within a specific theoretical and ideological framework, and this framework was implicitly present throughout all of Crawford's discourses. Although these *observations* primarily served to confirm some prejudicially held stereotypes on the Asian societies, the descriptions based on these nevertheless managed to reflect- and to account for the differences between the countries that Crawford visited; thus these travel discourses seem to have provided a more diversified, heterogeneous, and plastic concept of Oriental despotism than one might initially be inclined to assume.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the main hypothesis put forward in *Knapman 2006*, and although he in my opinion sometimes stressed the point further than his source-material ought to allow him to do, the core of the argument still appears convincing.

<sup>2</sup> See especially *Bastin 1957*; for Crawford's own retrospective reflection on this, see *Crawford 1856*, p.363-364.





## **Part III. Words Don't Come Easy.**

### **Philology, Epistemology, and Politics in the Knowledge of the 'Other'.**

“There are many open questions concerning the use of “savage” languages in Enlightenment glottogonic theories. Which languages were they? Which linguistic features did theoretical historians fasten upon? How did they interpret their information? Who were their informants? What data were available or accessible? What data were actually used? How were they used?”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Schreyer*, p.325.



## Philology and Its Intellectual Contexts.

In “Brodie’s Report”, J.L. Borges’ pastiche of a nineteenth century ethnological-linguistic treatise, the Presbyterian Scottish missionary David Brodie described a hitherto unknown African tribe<sup>1</sup> whose way of life almost rendered them more bestial than the simian “Apemen” with whom they were in a state of incessant warfare.<sup>2</sup> This people was named “Mlch”, or by Brodie simply called the “Yahoos”.<sup>3</sup>

Like the real travellers and missionaries in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> C., the fictitious Brodie employed the study of language – both as a medium through which other features of this primitive society could be approached and assessed, as well it was as an object worthy of study in itself. The former was especially due to the ways in which it both reflected the level of civilization and represented the specific qualities, and perhaps even a unique genius, of the society in question. Although facing the apparently insurmountable obstacle of not being able to speak, indeed hardly capable of communicating,<sup>4</sup> with the Yahoos, Brodie, again in concordance with many real travellers, did not demur before offering a sweeping synthesis of the structure of their language. In one of his discussions on *a priori philosophical languages*, U. Eco has referred to the language spoken by the Yahoos in “Brodie’s Report.”<sup>5</sup> It is perfectly plausible to do as Eco and inscribe this language into an interpretive context primarily orientated towards 17<sup>th</sup> C. theories on the possibility of construing a perfect language with a flawless correspondence between the assumed true order of the world and the logic structure of this perfect language.<sup>6</sup> Yet, it could just as well be interpreted as an ironic commentary on the ideas on the origin and evolution of language and society that were paradigmatic for a great part of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> C., something which Eco himself seemed to intimate at the end of his analysis.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The text was vague regarding the geographical location; yet it mentioned that Brodie had been a missionary in both Africa and Brazil, something which, combined with the references in the text to the interactions of this tribe with Muslim slavers, points rather unequivocally to Africa.

<sup>2</sup> This warfare between utterly primitive man and its closest relative, the “apemen” appears to contain many resemblances with manner in which the Austrian Friedrich Müller envisioned the origins of mankind as a struggle with nature in primeval times in his “Allgemeine Ethnographie”. (1873) (*Gregorio*, p.98. *Gregorio’s italics*)

<sup>3</sup> The term was obviously borrowed from Lemuel Gulliver’s last travel where it referred to a group of vile and savage creatures who nonetheless had an unsettling number of features in common with mankind; hence, whereas Swift’s Yahoos were manlike creatures, Borges’ Yahoos were bestial men.

<sup>4</sup> Thus, Brodie was facing the same predicament as the one of analysed by W.O. Quine as the ultimative instance of *radical interpretation* and the indeterminacy of translation; that is, how is it at all possible to enter the language, and hence the life-world, of an utterly foreign society (or extraterrestrials for that matter!) without sharing any common ground, except an identical material world upon which a meaningful communication has to be instigated and established. (Discussed in “Word and Object”, 1960; see also *Collin & Guldman*, pp.219-257, and *Pinker*, pp.153-157)

<sup>5</sup> *Eco* 1998, pp.94-95.

<sup>6</sup> See esp. *Eco* 1995, chapters 10-13..

<sup>7</sup> *Eco* 1998, p.94.

According to Brodie, the language of the Yahoos was identified as being *radically unaffiliated* with all other languages and its structure was most peculiar: it was strictly monosyllabic, possessed only atomic words and apparently no coherent sentences, contained no vocalic sounds, and sounds and gestures, especially facial expressions (grimaces), were essentially entwined in their language. However, the strangest feature rested doubtlessly not on the expression-plane but within content-plane of the language;<sup>1</sup> it was thus asserted that the verbal expressions each articulated a *general idea* on the most abstract level, and these were subsequently attributed a specific meaning through the gestures and grimaces accompanying them in each specific context.

Brodie's assertions on the language spoken by the Yahoos ought not to have incited much interest in the context of this study, lest had it not been for the inferences that he made on this basis, and which seem quite emblematic for the fields we are going to examine in this Part. The absence of vocalic sounds in the language obviously alluded to a similar lack of vocals in the *written* Hebrew, the language that traditionally had been perceived as constituting the original *and* perfect language given to Adam by God.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, this absence of vocalic sounds also impeded it from possessing any notion of musicality; this excluded any possibility of this language having had its origin in song, such as some theories of the day claimed that all language had.<sup>3</sup> All of this seemed to indicate that the Presbyterian missionary Brodie posited himself amongst those who opined that the origin of language was divine and perfect rather than natural and gradual. These intimations were later reified when he stated that the Yahoos were not as much a primitive as a degenerated tribe. This time the argument was based on evidence derived from the semantic aspect of the language: in contrast to the ordinarily expected correspondence between societal and linguistic primitiveness,<sup>4</sup> the language of the Yahoos was endowed with the intellectual virtue of abstraction in a degree that would not be expected, or perhaps even deemed possible, unless their society had once possessed the same level of sophistication of which their language still contained some vestiges of.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This structural distinction between the expression- and content-plane was originally coined by the Danish structuralist linguist, L. Hjelmslev (for a brief discussion, see *Hjelmslev 1963*, esp. pp.94-110); see also *Eco 1995*, pp.20-24.

<sup>2</sup> As it has been thoroughly discussed in e.g. *Olender*, chapter 1-3, and *Eco 1995*, chapter 1. Some of the crucial questions in this context were whether it was the linguistic structure (a *Universal Grammar*), or the actual words that God had given to mankind, and whether the Hebrew now spoken was the same as the original Hebrew, or had it, like all other languages, been fundamentally changed by dispersion after the Tower of Babel.

<sup>3</sup> This was for instance claimed by Herder; see e.g. *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, p.151, *Olender*, pp.31-36. The debates on the temporal sequence of poetry and prose constituted a key theme in most debates on the origin and development – whether progressionist or degenerationist – of language and society; Crawford too made appeal to this aspect in his theories, as it has already been alluded to.

<sup>4</sup> As it was particularly asserted in Spadafora's analysis of the ascendancy of the trope of progression in 18<sup>th</sup> C. British thought (*Spadafora*, pp.181-202).

<sup>5</sup> Such an argument could potentially be further underpinned by claiming that in their current (sub)savage stage it would be inconceivable that they should have been able to adopt such a refined linguistic feature from the outside (apart from no other society possessing this particular structure!) and incorporated it into their language without in any other aspect of society having absorbed such an influence.

The study of language constituted a continuous interest throughout both the 18<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> C.; as stressed by J. Burrow, it continued to occupy a core position in the fields of ethnology, philosophy, the philosophy of history, comparative religion and mythology, and the study of classical antiquity.<sup>1</sup> As demonstrated in the preceding Part, the methodologies and knowledge associated with *all* of these fields were invoked when defining the spatial extension and ‘nature’ of the Indian Archipelago, or its contemporary geographical equivalents, as well as when producing the history of this region. Probably nowhere was the study of language attributed a greater importance than within ethnology, and particularly in the British context during roughly the first five or six decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> C.; here it seemed to enjoy an almost unrivalled methodological primacy.<sup>2</sup> Both during these years and later amongst Victorian anthropologists, ethnology was, in the words of G. Beer, “principally concerned with three interlocking topics: the question of *kinship between diverse peoples*; the question of *developmental hierarchy* among races; and the *question of language*, both as a means of assessing the movements of peoples across the globe, and as a tool for the interpretation of cultural development”.<sup>3</sup>

Crawfurd proved throughout all his productive career to be representative of this approach; from the very beginning to the end he thus emphasized the importance of language – as often providing the best, and at times the only, access to the past of all the peoples who did not possess what was deemed reliable written historical accounts. HIA abounded with phrases like “language affords the only rational means of ascertaining *the early progress of society* among a rude people”, and “from the evidence of language, the only one which can be safely trusted in investigating whatever refers to *the origin and history* of barbarous nations”.<sup>4</sup> These methodological assessments were reiterated right up to Crawfurd’s last article.<sup>5</sup> His insistence on the paramount importance of procuring linguistic evidence did not pass unnoticed in Crawfurd’s own time, and it was accentuated as one of the foremost qualities of Crawfurd’s work by the renowned German based Norwegian Indologist C.

---

<sup>1</sup> Burrow 1967, p.181.

<sup>2</sup> The position of the Biblical-genealogical framework remained more intact in the British context than on the continent where especially in France explicit secular theories were much more integrated in mainstream ethnology and anthropology; although important in both, language was much more privileged in the former than in the latter, where biologically based racial theories played a much more important role. (See esp. Stocking 1973 and Stocking 1987 for the former and Staum for the latter). Among the countless examples of professing this quintessential role played by language, see e.g. Hodgkin 1827, p.377; Beke, p.292; the anonymous author of the papers on “Ethnography” in Hogg’s *Weekly Instructor* (1846) (e.g. p.91). This trend was not seriously countered until the 1860s where e.g. T. Huxley argued assiduously against this widespread methodological primacy of philology (Huxley 1899, p.214-216; orig. 1865).

<sup>3</sup> Beer, p.81; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.I, p.311 & p.358; my italics. These quotations – which are deliberately not chosen from the chapters on language but on the parts dealing with “Progress in Science and the Higher Arts” and “Agriculture” – are fairly indicative of the approach in this work.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Crawfurd 1869a, p.133.

Lassen in 1847.<sup>1</sup> In the articles published in TES throughout the 1860s he continuously reverted to the question of the applicability and reliability of using language as an analytical tool, when he addressed the fundamental questions along which the burgeoning discipline of ethnology was structured during these years.<sup>2</sup> Two of the articles did even allude to this instrumentalist invocation of language in their titles: “On the Antiquity of Man from the Evidence of Language” and “On Languages as a test of the Races of Man”;<sup>3</sup> whereas he, in an article on the third quintessential topic in the ethnology of the 1860s, viz. that of the early migrations of man, stated in unequivocal terms that the “evidence of language is irrefragable, and it is the only evidence worth listening to with regard to ante-historical periods”.<sup>4</sup>

Even when he wrote the two volume “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language” in 1852, and thus worked within the genre par excellence of pure linguistics, Crawfurd dedicated the major part of the roughly 300 pages long introductory dissertation to “inquiring into the nature and origin” of the shared linguistic features in the vast region between Madagascar and Easter Island and “to trace the progress of society among nations and tribes substantially without records, and of whose history and social advancement nothing valuable can be known beyond what such [linguistic] evidence will yield”.<sup>5</sup> Although Crawfurd’s name today appear more frequently in texts dealing with the development of a hardened concept of race in Victorian science and society, than he is referred to in his capacity as Orientalist and linguist, it should not be ignored that throughout his entire career he ascribed a paramount importance to the study of language, and particularly to its instrumental use as a provider of historical and ethnological evidence, as well as he drew attention to its limitations as an unreliable marker of (biological) race, as it will be discussed later in this Part.

Throughout this Part, I will approach the field from a bird’s eye view that emphasizes the aspects of continuity, while simultaneously focussing on some of the recurring themes in Crawfurd et al’s

---

<sup>1</sup> In his synthesis of all the available research on the ancient history of India, “Indische Alterthumskunde” (4 vols. And an appendix, 1847-1862), Lassen emphasized that “einer der lichtvollsten und anziehendsten Theile des Crawfurd’schen Werkes ist seine Bestimmung des ursprünglichen Culturzustandes des Archipels vermittelt der Sprache.” (*Lassen 1847*, pp.468-469. Lassen consistently translated Crawfurd’s use of the term *civilization* with *Culturzustand*)

<sup>2</sup> This was despite the fact that Crawfurd at this time was perceived by his contemporaries as one of those who most insistently stressed the methodological and epistemic limits of the use of language in the field of ethnology (see e.g. *Farrar*, p.252, and *Huxley 1899*, p.216 where he sided with Crawfurd against the methodological primacy of philology)

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1863c* and *Crawfurd 1865a*.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawfurd 1865c*, p.347.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawfurd 1852*, Vol.I, p.1. The importance vested in these questions can be fairly well grasped by the fact that the dissertation occupied 291 pages, whereas the grammar itself was only 82 pages long; volume 2 contained a Malay-English and an English-Malay dictionary. Although one should be more than wary with equating the quantity that a given topic occupies in book with the importance attributed to it, the preponderance of these questions in Crawfurd’s discourse are nevertheless further illustrated, when Crawfurd’s Grammar and Dictionary is compared to the likewise 2 volume Grammar and Dictionary written by Marsden in 1812: in Marsden’s work the correspondent “Introduction”, dealing with roughly the same topics, occupied only 50 pages, whereas he spent 225 pages on his analysis of the grammar of the Malay language.

discourses. Special attention will be paid to the roles ascribed to language in the intersections between the notions of stadial civilization and genealogical relation, between independent origin and diffusion, or whether these aspects should be inscribed within the general tropes of progression or perhaps degeneration. In this way I aim at delineating the disciplinary interplay and paradigmatic co-dependencies involved in the development of the fields of philology and ethnology throughout this period, and at sketching the basic contours of some of the main concepts involved in these processes; this will, furthermore, provide an apt epistemic template that facilitates the diachronic narrative which follows in Part IV.

In the following I intend to examine: 1) how the *origins*, *dissemination*, and *status* of the *nations*, *race(s)*, and the *civilization(s)* within the Indian Archipelago and the adjacent regions were assessed through the medium of language; 2) how *linguistic evidence* was produced and presented as proving or disproving the theories in question; 3) the *modes of argumentation* and the *explanative strategies* that were employed and considered the most authoritative in providing an authentic and exhaustive explanation of the ethnology and early history of the region. This requires an analytical focus on the relations between *linguistic evidence* and other types of evidence; on what kind of *linguistic elements* that were deemed to supply adequate evidence in the contexts of the origin, dissemination, and level of the different nations, or race(s), or civilization(s); and what were the ascribed internal relations between the concepts of nation, race, and civilization.





# 1. Contextualizing Crawford's Theories of Language.

The study of language in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> C. did only on very rare occasions constitute an end in itself; rather, it was a means to illuminate some other aspects of man's past and nature, notwithstanding whether these were perceived mainly reside within the realms of philosophical (natural)-, sacred-, or civil history.<sup>1</sup> As T.R. Trautmann has argued with regard to Sir William Jones's his Anniversary Discourses: "The main thing to grasp about the "Anniversary Discourses" is that they *were an ethnological and historical study, not a linguistic one as such*; thus the *language data* function into the argument as *evidence for propositions about historical relations among nations or races*, not for propositions about historical relations about languages as an end in itself. Far from constituting the study of languages as a self-contained discipline, Jones treats language as a means, and just one of many means, to disentangle ethnological relationships."<sup>2</sup>

There were, however, some very moot points in this context; these were especially concerned with what kind of "language data" that constituted the most reliable evidence, as well as the function that this evidence played for the propositions regarding the origins- and relations between the nations, races, and civilizations whose histories were examined through the medium of language. What remained beyond question, though, was the very applicability of language data as a/the most reliable provider of evidence in these contexts: "the connectedness of language with issues of nations and race remained so deeply presumed that it was not available for discussion and debate".<sup>3</sup> It formed an integrated part of the epistemic, *naturalized* stock of knowledge in the intellectual environment in which these debates were conducted; so even when absent from the surfaces of the texts these tacit, yet preponderate assumptions continued to permeate the discourses.

## 1.1 The Scriptures, Genealogy, History, and Ethnology.

Since late antiquity language had constituted a quintessential part in the tracing of the migratory routes of the different nations or races, such as these were sketched within the Biblical framework.<sup>4</sup> This framework prescribed a monotheistic assumption which postulated that all languages, analogues to all peoples, ultimately could be traced back to the same location of origin from whence they had spread in all directions, this was just like the ramifications of a giant tree, in order to occupy the vast expanses of the globe. Tracing the genealogical affiliations of the languages back to their origin thus implied a parallel tracing of the genealogical relations of the human nations, tribes,

---

<sup>1</sup> See also *Hoquet*, esp. pp.41-53 on the variations and dynamics in the uses of the term 'history' and the notions associated herewith during the 18<sup>th</sup> C.

<sup>2</sup> *Trautmann 2006*, p.15; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> *Trautmann 2006*, p.15. See also *Schreyer*, pp.318-320.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. *Høiris 2001a*.

and races who spoke those languages.<sup>1</sup> The preferred medium through which these linguistic relations were traced had long been through recognition of the *same words*, expressing approximately the same thing, phenomenon, idea, or subsidiary action; hence the *analytical gaze* was primarily directed towards the expression-plane of language, and with most emphasis paid to its lexical units<sup>2</sup> and particularly to the nouns. From approximately late 16<sup>th</sup> C. the interest in this genealogical approach in relation to the questions of the origin and earliest history of man soared: the Age of the great discoveries – and not at least the encounter with the New World and the resulting enigma regarding the origin of the Amerindians who apparently did not possess any written records of their own past – spurred this interest, and here comparative etymology played a crucial part. From G. Postel's reckless etymologies<sup>3</sup> over A. Kircher's megalomaniac speculations<sup>4</sup> and A. Reland's more cautious inferences<sup>5</sup> to the persistent recourse to ultimately materialistic foundations involved H. Tooke's etymological tracings, etymology remained an untamed art, more prone to be pursued by philological mavericks than constituting a well-defined and enclosed scientific discipline.<sup>6</sup> This occasioned the production of a plethora of self-asserting and contradictory hypotheses wherein the genealogical proximity of the "chosen" nation in question (most often the country of the philologist himself) to the original Hebrew was postulated and then subsequently explained.<sup>7</sup> This enterprise, as a contributing factor in the 'self fashioning' of the nation or the state, obviously enwrapped the whole etymological project in an ideological cloak, and often equipped it with overtly political connotations.<sup>8</sup>

It was within this intellectual context that the Oxford scholar in Persian and other Oriental languages, Sir William Jones<sup>9</sup> conceived and framed his well known hypothesis on the radical relationship between Sanskrit and several European languages that later evolved into the theory of existence of an Indo-European language family.<sup>10</sup> But Jones, as it has already been mentioned,

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Trautmann 1997/2004*, chapter 1 and *Stocking 1987*, chapters 1-2 for a general discussion.

<sup>2</sup> See *Eco 1995*, ch. 5 for the changes in theories and applied evidence before the 19<sup>th</sup> C. In *Trautmann 2009a*, pp.112-120 the problems arising out of competing approaches and methods in a colonial contexts are discussed. For a general introduction to the theories and methods in the recognition of language relationship, see *Hock & Joseph*, ch. 16.

<sup>3</sup> See esp. *Eco 1995*, pp.75-80 and *Irwin 2006*, pp.66-71.

<sup>4</sup> On the many linguistic projects of this eccentric polyhistor, see *Eco 1995*, pp.83-85, 154-165 & 196-206, and *Eco 1997*, pp.61-69, as well as *Irwin 2006*, pp.106-108.

<sup>5</sup> *Schreyer*, pp.311-314 and *Irwin 2006*, pp.126.

<sup>6</sup> I thus fully concur with T. Benes's analysis: "Until the nineteenth century, etymology was largely a speculative science. Comparativists lacked adequate tools for bridging the historical distance between recorded languages and those tongues alluded to in the Jewish Bible." (*Benes 2008*, p.69)

<sup>7</sup> See esp. *Eco 1995*, pp.95-103.

<sup>8</sup> As stressed by Aarsleff: "The seventeenth century did not use etymology to seek and perhaps gain information but rather to support – and as they thought prove – preconceived beliefs." (*Aarsleff 1982*, p.91)

<sup>9</sup> Jones was an accomplished oriental scholar already before leaving for India to occupy a post as a judge. See e.g. *Marshall & Williams*, chapter 3 and *Irwin 2006*, pp.122-124.

<sup>10</sup> On the discrepancies between Jones' original ideas on this language family and its position in the larger global framework, and the ideas of a privileged linguistic-racial Indo-European family that developed in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., see especially *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.10-16.

originally inscribed this linguistic affinity within a genealogical framework that was global in its scope and traced the origins back to the sons of Noah. The (future) Indo-European languages<sup>1</sup> were in this framework primarily assessed as just one branch of a global relationship; this facilitated close comparisons between the ancient Indian and Egyptian civilizations and even with the Aztec and Inca empires,<sup>2</sup> although posterity, and especially the history of linguistics with its bias towards a presentist teleology, has tended to ignore these latter aspects of Jones's linguistic studies.

In such a globally extended framework, with the Indian subcontinent ascribed a pivotal position, it hardly seemed surprising that Jones thought to recognize a genealogical link between Sanskrit on the one hand and Malay and its cognate languages on the other, even though the linguistic evidence available to him was scarce and of a second-hand nature.<sup>3</sup> Jones's main source of information was W. Marsden who possessed an intimate knowledge of the latter languages and (some of) the peoples who spoke them. Marsden defied Jones's identification of such a genealogical link between Sanskrit and Malay, as mentioned in the previous chapter. Not because Marsden disputed the applicability of the genealogical model in the study of the affinities of languages, nor was he opposed to the then naturalized and corollary relations between the languages and various nations or races that spoke these. On the contrary, genealogy constituted the organizing principle in Marsden's own formulation of the group of radically cognate insular languages that he later dubbed the Polynesian languages, and which he had established already in 1780 – 4 years before Jones went out to the Bengal.<sup>4</sup> Marsden had thus identified the existence of a huge, genealogically linked language family, and had defined its characteristics independent of-, and before, Jones's much more famous "discovery" of the Indo-European language family. The well proven existence of words of apparently Sanskrit origin in Malay and the neighbouring languages should according to Marsden not be taken as a proof of their genealogical relationship: these terms derived from Sanskrit did not belong to the group of words that Marsden deemed to be *radical words*, indicative of a genealogical relation; thence they were assumed to have been incorporated in the Malay and the neighbouring languages at a later stage and as a consequence of interactions between the two asymmetrically

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'Indo-European' seemed to have been originally coined by the English linguist Thomas Young in a review of J.C. Adelung's "Mithridates, oder Allgemeine Sprachenkunde", in the Quarterly Review vol.10 (1814), pp.250-292. The references to 'Indo-European' occurred the first time on p.255. See *Olender*, p.151 and *Trautmann 1997/2004*, p.13.

<sup>2</sup> The possibility of such connections were intimated in *Jones 1824*, Vol.II p.15 (Discourse IX, "On the Origin and Families of Nations" – "nor is it unreasonable to believe, that some of them found their way from the eastern islands into Mexico and Peru, where traces were discovered of rude literature and mythology analogous to those of Egypt and India"; that is, along the same route as the one later elaborated by Lang in his grand hypothesis), and pp.122-123 ("On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India"). As emphasized by Trautmann, Jones operated with "a 'two-nation' conception of the ethnology of the New World, according to which the civilized peoples of Mexico and Peru were colonies of his Hindus (and hence Hamians), while the nomadic Indians were Tartars (Japhetites)." (*Trautmann 1997/2004*, p.50)

<sup>3</sup> *Jones 1824*, pp.138-139 (VIII. Discourse).

<sup>4</sup> To my knowledge, Trautmann is the only one who has paid some attention to this fact, and sought to re-ascribe Marsden a more prominent position in the history of linguistics (see *Trautmann 1997/2004* and esp. *Trautmann 2006*).

civilized nations, speaking these radically different languages. Interactions that could have been the result of trade, emigration, proselytizing, and colonization, or outright conquest; these particulars regarding the actual modes of interaction were assumed to be inferable from the classes of words that were adopted from Sanskrit.<sup>1</sup>

Despite being inveterately dedicated to the genealogical model derived from a Biblical framework, the spatio-temporal scope of Marsden's approach had a more limited extension, and the ethnological inferences that he drew from his linguistic analysis were more cautious. Whatever philosophical and/or religious views on the origin, nature and earliest history and man and language Marsden may have entertained, these were entirely absent from his writings on the Polynesian languages. Whenever the presence of these questions became too imminent in his discourse, and omission no longer seemed an option, he took refuge in phrases like: "to trace, *if possible*, a common origin";<sup>2</sup> "to give it claim to the highest degree of antiquity, and to *originality*, as far as that term can be applied";<sup>3</sup> "bespeaks a high degree of antiquity, and gives claim to *originality*, as far as we can venture to apply that term, which *signifies no more than the state beyond which we have not the means, either historically or by fair inference, of tracing the origin*. In this restricted sense it is that we are justified in considering the main portion of the Malay as original or indigenous; *its affinity to any continental tongue not having yet been shewn*; and least of all can we suppose it connected with the monosyllabic or Indo-Chinese, with which it has been classed";<sup>4</sup> and "we must be content to regard the language as original, in the ordinary sense of the expression, implying no more than *its origin being in a state of obscurity beyond which no connecting line or derivation can be traced*".<sup>5</sup> The genealogical trope was thus, at least on the explicit level, disentangled from the Biblical ethnology in Marsden's discourse.<sup>6</sup> It was this reluctance towards any sweeping synthesis regarding the ultimate origin which, paired with his usually assiduous and acute analysis of the linguistic relationships, imputed a more 'modern' quality to Marsden's approach than, for instance, Jones's linguistic studies evinced when these are situated within their original contexts.

---

<sup>1</sup> As it was discerned in e.g. *Marsden 1812*, pp.xxv-xxxiii for a discussion of the various possible hypotheses regarding this dissemination.

<sup>2</sup> *Marsden 1782*, 154; after this remark he did not return to the question of *origin* in this article, except from the remark that it could "be argued that the resembling or common words are radical and such whose correspondent ideas must have existed and been described *prior to all intercourse with either remote or neighbouring people*" (p.156); my italics.

<sup>3</sup> *Marsden 1798*, p.227. My italics.

<sup>4</sup> *Marsden 1812*, pp.xx-xxi; my italics. Hence *originality* should in Marsden's discourses only be interpreted in a strictly heuristic sense, intentionally deprived of any ontological implications or connotations. The reference to the classification of Malay as part of the Indo-Chinese languages referred to Leyden's classification.

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1834*, p.5.

<sup>6</sup> As what seemed to have been part of a deliberate discourse, evading all references to this ideologically cogent topic; this, apparently intended, discursive disentanglement of his texts from any politically affiliated sphere could, and indeed appeared to facilitate an apoliticised and more 'scientific' reception of his hypothesis by all implied parts.

If Jones's approach and theories were the result of Moderate Enlightenment and a mediated rapprochement between rational religion and secular science,<sup>1</sup> then J.D. Lang's approach seemed to epitomize the world-view belonging to the missionaries of the reactionary period that followed in the wake of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.<sup>2</sup> Rather than bridging the epistemological gap between the authority of the Scriptures and the secular theories on the origin and evolution of man and language, Lang widened this rift through a rhetoric that consistently styled the opinions expressed in especially the Scottish Enlightenment as "the implicit faith of infidelity", "the infidelity of modern science", and as "the dogmatism of certain infidel philosophers".<sup>3</sup> On the more polemical level, Lang exhibited at least the same inimical approach to "the frequently expressed opinions of Gibbon, Hume, Lord Kames, and Helvetius, as well as certain other philosophers of the modern German school" as he did towards the dogmatically even more anathematized theories of biological polygenism, "the groundwork of one of the of the most recently erected superstructures of infidelity",<sup>4</sup> such as they were advanced by e.g. Dr. von Martius and Dr. Spix in the account of their travels and researches in Brazil.<sup>5</sup> Lang seemed to have sought his ideological opponents, not so much amongst the proponents of biological polygenism, as in the perhaps less profane, but politically more influential theories on the progress of civilization from savagery to refinement. This became even more enounced in his dismissal of the possibilities of propagating the tenets of the Christian faith through the medium of a 'civilizing mission'.<sup>6</sup>

The uses of linguistic evidence within a genealogical trope differed with the greater ethnological, religious, and ideological frameworks within which this trope was employed. Yet, it was not merely the *uses of the linguistic evidence* that differed, but also the *identification and selection of linguistic data* and the manners in which these were *discursively transformed into evidence*.

## 1.2 Progress, Civilization, and Language.

The monogenetic, Biblical narrative had already been challenged in 17<sup>th</sup> C. by, amongst others, Isaac La Peyr  re with his theories on the hypothetical existence of a Pre-adamic race of people; the existence of these was mainly asserted through intra-Scriptural evidence,<sup>7</sup> and their blood did perhaps still run in the veins of their of possible descendants who would still speak descendent

<sup>1</sup> For an analysis of role played by religion in the *Moderate Enlightenment* in the British context, see Kidd 2006, chapter 4 and Spadafora, chapters 3 & 8 (and esp. pp.255-263).

<sup>2</sup> See Trautmann 1997/2004, pp.99-101.

<sup>3</sup> Lang 1834, pp.91, 137, & 151. For more on J.D. Lang, his missionary activities, and the framework of mission and empire in which Lang preached and acted, see Lester 2005, pp.72-75, and Carey 2011, esp. pp.226-237.

<sup>4</sup> Lang 1834, pp.90 173-174.

<sup>5</sup> The Botanists Martius and Spix travelled in Brazil in the years 1817-1820, being commissioned by the Bavarian king. Their travel account was published in 1823 and later translated to English (2 vols., London 1824). The many references to this text indicate that it had an influential impact; for an assessment of this, see e.g. Hodgkin 1835, p.11.

<sup>6</sup> On the contrary, Lang claimed that Christianity had to precede civilization. (Lang 1834, pp.240-253)

<sup>7</sup> For antiquarian researches in the context of pre-Adamic races, see Schnapp, pp.222-234.

tongues of these pre-adamic people.<sup>1</sup> The debates on whether Pre-adamic, or Co-adamic, peoples had existed and on how their possible affinity with present peoples and races continued, although, as lucidly demonstrated by D.N. Livingstone,<sup>2</sup> the discursive function of the Pre-adamic theories shifted during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. from representing an iconoclastic challenge of the absolute authority of the Scriptures towards a rhetoric of harmonization between religion and science.<sup>3</sup> Crudely put, within the contexts of scientific pursuits, the Scriptures went from constituting the referential framework within which ethnology and the earliest history of man was firmly embedded towards increasingly offering a source of information that could be appropriated by-, as well as assessed within an ever enlarging scientific framework. However, although pre-adamism within some discourses operated “as a Harmonizing strategy” this did not imply that it, as stressed by Livingstone, “acted as a conceptual bridge between two discrete spheres of knowledge and belief. Rather it functioned as a kind of mold that sculpted both scientific commitment and theological conviction into a distinctive shape”.<sup>4</sup> Structural reminiscences of this Scriptural approach hence continued to linger on in the scientific discourses, even when they explicitly had been stripped of their religious connotations; the seamless appropriation of the genealogical approach as constituting an undisputed, authoritative master trope was a flagrant example of this.

However, the monogenetic hypothesis came under attack from another angle too: this was launched by the advocates of what U. Eco has termed the “materialist-biological theory of the origin of language”, and which claimed that language was a product of man’s *natural instinct* towards transforming sensations into ideas and expressing these ideas in ever more *articulated systems*; systems that were normally composed of sounds – that is, what is ordinarily perceived as constituting a language.<sup>5</sup> They claimed inspiration from Epicurus’ ancient ideas of how the names of things were not ordained by any inviolable edict, but that they on the contrary stemmed from the innate nature of man; the products of this human nature, and hence also language, were profoundly influenced by the climates, locations, etc. in which they flourished. This paved the way for the possibility-, or perhaps even the probability, of polygenetic origins on language (if not necessarily of man per se), and this could imply the presence of various, independently originated families of

---

<sup>1</sup> Although blood- and linguistic relations were often assumed to be overlapping they were not necessarily identical (on this topic, see for instance Olender’s analysis of Renan’s and Max Müller’s reflections on blood ties vs. language as the most apt criterion for the definition of race; *Olender*, ch.4-5). So, even if descendants of a Pre-Adamic race might still exist, they could in the course of times have adopted either the use of language per se or the languages spoken by the Adamic descendants; hence, a positive inscription of all languages within the Adamic race and the monogenetic Biblical framework would not necessarily imply that the existence of descendants of a Pre-Adamic race, let alone its historical existence, could be positively excluded.

<sup>2</sup> See *Livingstone 1992b* and *Livingstone 2008*; see also *Kidd 2006* and *Eco 1995*, pp.85-91.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the responses to these “challenges” of Scriptural authority, see *Kidd 2006*, pp.121-135 and *Livingstone 2008*, e.g. pp.107-08.

<sup>4</sup> *Livingstone 2008*, p.220.

<sup>5</sup> *Eco 1995*, pp.88-89.

languages between which no genealogical links existed. Ld. Kames was probably the best known exponent of this interpretation in Enlightenment.

During the 18<sup>th</sup> C. these ideas evolved into the theories on the interlocked progression of civilization and the increasing refinement of language. By perceiving it as an integrated part of the study of society and its stadial evolution,<sup>1</sup> the study of language was used to address more philosophical questions, such as 1) what was the origin of thought, 2) did the mind have a material basis, 3) did mankind have one single origin or several ones, 4) was the first language given by revelation or invented in the process of time, and 5) could etymology be made instructive in answering these questions?<sup>2</sup> Our main concern here is that this framework primarily privileged an interest in the content-plane of the language and particularly in the philosophical question of the relationship between *language-ideas-world*. These queries were addressed both by the rationalist School associated with Descartes and the Port Royal Grammar of Lancelot and Arnauld, and by an empirico-sensationalist one which built upon the problems raised in Locke's epistemological theories.<sup>3</sup> The former tended to claim a complete isomorphism between language and ideas – and amongst the hardcore isomorphists these were also considered identical with the true structure of the outer world.<sup>4</sup> This approach entailed “that [1] if discourse is the image of thought and [2] if thought is subject to the laws of reason, then [3] discourse itself must reveal and illustrate the laws of reason”; this resulted in the claim that *language is a copy of the mind*.<sup>5</sup> Whereas this approach did not necessarily insist on any notion of development, the dynamical aspect was quintessential to the empirico-sensationalist approach: building upon Locke's ideas of language being a fallible (yet the only available) representation of the ideas that grew out of our epistemological faculties, this was later developed by philosophers like Condillac, de Brosses, and the Ideologues, including Degérando. In the British context it was Horne Tooke who took this approach to its absolute limits.

Through an imaginative tracing of the etymologies of various words, H. Tooke (1736-1812) claimed to be able to demonstrate that the meaning of all words had their ultimate origin in sensory impressions conveyed upon a passive mind. For Tooke language was not representative of, imitating, or constitutive of thought, but it was *identical* with thought. This approach had far reaching implications, and Tooke took them to their most radical conclusions: that all words in the end could be traced back to nouns or verbs (themselves intimately related to sensory impressions) resulted in an unconditional materialism that constituted the most controversial and ideologically

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Spadafora, pp.181-202.

<sup>2</sup> Aarsleff 1966/1983, p.4.

<sup>3</sup> I have borrowed this nomenclature from Eco 1995, p.107; however, the most thorough analysis is found in Aarsleff 1966/1983, esp. ch.1-2.

<sup>4</sup> As stated by Paxman: “Universal grammar tended to assume that the mind, language, and external nature are fitted to each other like hand, glove, and handle.” (Paxman 1993, p.28)

<sup>5</sup> Aarsleff 1966/1983, p.14.

charged aspect of Tooke's theories. This theory furthermore privileged the study of etymology to such a degree that it came to be considered a methodological panacea, facilitating decisive and convincing evidence within both the realms of philosophy and history.<sup>1</sup> H. Aarsleff has been instrumental in establishing the profound impact that H. Tooke's publications made upon British, and in particular English, studies of language at least up to c.1830.<sup>2</sup> The politically cogent discursive fields, demarcated by the debates that followed in the wake of Tooke's controversial writings, proved to be a ideological obstacle to the introduction of the new linguistic theories and methodological approaches that in the meantime had arisen on the Continent and which, ironically, was actually spurred by Sir W. Jones's lectures at the Asiatick Society in Calcutta.<sup>3</sup> Even the most inveterate opponents of Tooke's theories and methodological approaches, like Dugald Stewart and S.T. Coleridge,<sup>4</sup> did not accomplish to delegitimize the etymological modes of procedure upon which Tooke had founded his philosophical edifice, even when they managed to cast the tenets of his theories and their materialist basis into serious doubt.<sup>5</sup> The contemporary authority attributed to Tooke's etymology could partly be explained by the analogical linking that Tooke drew to the most fashionable science of the day, viz. chemistry.<sup>6</sup> Thus, even though Tooke's etymology in retrospect appeared closer to the arcane proceedings of alchemy than to the rigorous standards and reproducible results of science, this was not the main reproach launched against it then. Etymology was yet to acquire a methodological stringency, and, as the Danish philologist Rasmus Rask decried in the chapter "On Etymology, Generally" in his "Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse" from 1818, that etymology was a discipline which had occasioned the most unreasonable interpretations and allowed the most ridiculous whims to roam unimpeded.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of Tooke's theories and methods as well as a general assessment of the impact these had, see *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, pp.44-114; *Rosenberg*; and *Davies*, pp.28-30

<sup>2</sup> Although Tooke's theories did not survive for long or influenced the following generations of linguists, they had a tremendous impact in their day; as such their *reception* was much more cogent than their *effect*. (For an informed analysis of the differences and shared ground between the approaches rooted in 'Rezeptionsgeschichte' and 'Wirkungsgeschichte', see *Thompson*.)

<sup>3</sup> This irony was attenuated particularly in *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, pp.115-161.

<sup>4</sup> Their critique of Tooke was obviously not based on the same criteria; as succinctly put in *Alter 2005* (pp.55-57), Coleridge's criticized Tooke's theories from the viewpoint of his own version of Continental idealism, whereas Dugald Stewart had his basis in a Scottish Common-Sense approach to language. (For more on this critique see also *Goodson*, *Wallace 1980*, and especially *McKusick* regarding Coleridge, and *Aarsleff 1966/1983* pp.96-112 [esp. pp.103-106]).

<sup>5</sup> *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, p.70.

<sup>6</sup> On the explicit references to chemistry as an authority attributing strategy invoked by Tooke, see *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, pp.89-90; *Davies*, pp.28-29; and *Alter 2005*, p.56.

<sup>7</sup> *Rask 1818*, p.11. This essay ("Researches into the Origins of the Old Norse or Icelandic Language") was originally written in 1814 but not published until 4 years later. (*Rask 2002*, pp.94-101) Together with F. Bopp's "Über das Conjugationssystem der Sanskritsprache..." (1816) and J. Grimm's "Deutsche Grammatik" (1819, 2<sup>nd</sup>, revised ed. in 1822), this work is normally considered as inaugurating the comparative historical philology which profoundly shaped so many of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. ideas on language, prehistory, peoples, races, and nations. Although Rask was not as well known in his own time as the latter two, partly due to mainly publishing in Danish, his writings nonetheless inspired J. Grimm's theories on sounds shifts (*Benes 2008*, pp.122-123), and he was sufficiently well known in Great Britain to be offered the prestigious position as librarian of the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh in 1825, an offer which he in the end turned down preferring a professorship at the University of Copenhagen. (*Aarsleff 1966/1983*, p.179. For more on Rask and the



In the British realm, Tooke's theories were embraced most affectionately by philosophical Utilitarians and political Radicals like J. Bentham and James Mill,<sup>1</sup> even though they possessed "neither inclination nor competence to challenge the nitty gritty of Tooke's etymological work".<sup>2</sup> It seems to have been in his position as the household philologist of the Utilitarian and Radical causes, rather than out of an appreciation of the etymological work per se, that Crawford later referred to Tooke and the "Diversions of Purley"<sup>3</sup> as an authority. Neither in terms of methodological approaches nor respecting the general framework did Crawford actually follow in Tooke's trail.

Although rooted firmly in a progressionist framework and insisting on a natural rather than a divine origin of speech, some of these Enlightenment advocates<sup>4</sup> nevertheless reverted to a sort of historiographical syncretism, in which they combined the seemingly contradictory approaches of conjectural history and the story told in the Scriptures according to the traditional interpretations – perhaps in order to preserve, or in some cases merely to pay lip service to, religious orthodoxy.<sup>5</sup> Some thus dated the origin of the savage state to have happened shortly after either the Flood or the dispersion from the Tower of Babel, and they then stated that all memory of these events (save that contained in the Scriptures!) was supposed to have evaporated from the minds of man who thus became savage again;<sup>6</sup> hence they could incarnate an epistemological *tabula rasa* of the original, or *initial state*, as presupposed in conjectural history.<sup>7</sup>

---

contemporary reception of his researches, see *Rask 2002* and *Davies*, pp.125-129) Ten years later, the Scottish Orientalist Vans Kennedy would, in a similar vein, decry "the extravagancies of the etymologists" and the "ridicule to which etymologists, in general, so deservedly expose themselves". (*Kennedy*, p.239; see also p.iii) Kennedy undoubtedly invoked this, by now well established, topos of the wildly speculative and utterly unreliable etymology as a rhetorical strategy intended to distance his own work from this, and hence posit himself among a newer, more scientifically inclined breed of philologists. (see pp.iii-xii)

<sup>1</sup> *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, pp.73-114 (p.71 on Bentham's reception of Tooke's theories, pp.93-96 on James Mill's appropriation of Tooke's ideas), and *Aarsleff 1982*, p.7.

<sup>2</sup> *Davies*, p.28.

<sup>3</sup> Vol.I was published in 1786 and later republished before the Vol.II was finally issued in 1805.

<sup>4</sup> For instance most of the front figures of the Scottish Enlightenment which, with the marked exception of Hume and some eccentric opinions held by Kames and Monboddo, fell well within the confines of the *moderate* strand of the Enlightenment (see, e.g., *Spadafora*, ch.7 and the relevant parts of ch.4 in *Kidd 2006*).

<sup>5</sup> Livingstone analysed this dimension of Ld. Kames' theories in *Livingstone 2008*, pp.57-60.

<sup>6</sup> This interpretation did not fade away with the Enlightenment. C.T. Beke would thus echo exactly the same argument in 1835 when he stated that the "opinion of the gradual progress of civilization, ... is, at the best, purely hypothetical, ... it is actually at variance with the evidence of all history and experience." Hence it will "be more in accordance with the truth to assert that the savage and uncultivated condition of mankind, which has usually been designated *the state of nature*, is, in reality, nothing else than a degeneration from a previous social state, in which a high degree of culture and artificial attainments were possessed; and that, consequently, this latter condition (and not the former,) ought to be regarded as the primitive condition of the present human race." (*Beke*, p.286; the italics are Beke's own. This article reiterated the argument Beke had made at greater length in his "Origines Biblicae: or Researches in Primeval History")

<sup>7</sup> This syncretism obviously constituted a gross violation of one of the most fundamental principles of natural sciences and also ingrained in conjectural history, viz. that of Occam's razor; this prescribed the privileging of circumstantial parsimony when two hypotheses explained (exactly) the same. As discussed in Part I, D. Stewart had invoked precisely this scientific meta-principle in his discussion- and definition of conjectural history.

## 1.3 Crawfurd's Theories of Language and Their Intellectual Contexts.

### 1.3.1 Faith and the Origin(s) of Mankind and Language.

Until the 1860s, Crawfurd did never intimate any inclinations towards mediating between the narrative of origin, dispersion, and dissemination delineated in the Scriptures on the one hand, and the progressionist theories ingrained in conjectural history on the other. On the contrary. On the indeed very rare occasions where he referred to Biblical authority and to the narratives of the earliest history of mankind sanctioned by it, it was usually phrased in an ambiguous discourse, as when he in 1852 referred to the Christianization of the British Isles as “the admission of a second foreign religion”.<sup>1</sup> This way of referring to Christianity epitomized the salient absence of any (reverent) references to the Scriptures or of acknowledging their content as providing reliable information in Crawfurd's discourse; he seemed to share this feature with racist American anthropologists like Morton, Agassiz, Nott and Gliddon of the 1850s and 1860s. Despite a shared epistemological framework and quite similar methodological approaches to the science of man, Crawfurd nevertheless differed from these.<sup>2</sup> He did this both with regard to the vitriolic and utterly denigrating rhetoric employed by especially Nott and Gliddon, for instance in the texts published by these in “Types of Mankind: or, Ethnological Researches” from 1854, and with regard to the institution of slavery. Crawfurd did not accede to the argument that the existence of a rather *fixist racial hierarchy*,<sup>3</sup> a point upon which he concurred with these, did legitimize the institution of slavery; on the contrary, Crawfurd had, as mentioned earlier, actually championed the course of abolitionism since at least the 1830s. This stance was maintained in the 1850s and clearly mirrored in the commentaries attached to the entry on ‘Slavery’ in the “Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands” (1856). After having discussed the six different names for *slave* in Malay, Crawfurd concluded his entry with the following remark: “One circumstance, probably, mitigates the condition of slavery among the people of the Indian Islands, that the master and slave are almost

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, p.cxcix. The phrase appeared as part of an analogy to the presently existent vestiges of an assumed original animistic religion amongst the Javanese that predated the arrival of both the Hindus and the Muslims; in its entirety it sounded: “The Javanese have peopled the air, the woods, and rivers with various classes of spirits, their belief in which, probably, constituted their sole religion before the arrival of the Bramins. They, indeed, believe in them still, as our own, not very remote ancestors, did in fairies and witches, after the admission of a second foreign religion.” Benes sketched how J. Grimm in his “German Mythology” (1835) nurtured a kindred interpretation of the *foreign* and malign effects of the introduction of Christianity amongst the German ‘Volk’. (*Benes 2008*, pp.144-145)

<sup>2</sup> A.C. Nott thus mentioned a private correspondence with “my friend Mr. Crawfurd” on the topic of racial intermixture and religious creed on the Indian Subcontinent, where Crawfurd was referred to an expert. (In the essay “Comparative Anatomy of the Races”, in *Nott & Gliddon, 1854*, p.415)

<sup>3</sup> This term is Livingstone's (*Livingstone 2008*, pp.135-136), and he used it to denominate the prevailing pre-Darwinian episteme on the creation(s) of man and the impact this had on the racial theories, Scriptural interpretations, and ethnological histories – as well as the ideological implications and political contexts of these.

always of the same race,<sup>1</sup> – that there is no broad disparity in their conditions, such as exists in civilised communities, and that the severe labour of a calculating taskmaster is never extracted.”<sup>2</sup> Despite its ascribed maladies, slavery in this region was thus favourably contrasted to the keeping of African slaves in the West Indies and the Americas.<sup>3</sup>

It was this apparent disinclination to conciliate his conjectures on the earliest history of man with the version contained in the Scriptures that spurred the scathing critique of at least one anonymous reviewer of HIA; this reviewer, in the “British Review”,<sup>4</sup> argued against what was seen as a vagueness and lack of “philosophical precision of language”, especially with respect to the use of such terms as *aboriginal* and *indigenous* and for that sake *original* too. The core of the problem was, in the mind of the reviewer, that these terms, as they were used in Crawford’s discourse, might suggest a “hypothesis wholly repugnant to the only rational explication of the problem [of human origin], that which is contained in the Hebrew account of the creation”.<sup>5</sup> So, notwithstanding whether or not HIA, or any other of Crawford’s earlier writings, actually professed any kind of linguistic<sup>6</sup> or racial polygenism (albeit both definitely were latently present),<sup>7</sup> they were nonetheless perceived by some contemporaries as propagating precisely this, in the early 19 C., highly controversial stance. This alone would automatically locate Crawford amongst the more Radical segment of the current debates; and vice versa, Crawford’s well known affiliation with the Edinburgh Review and his diatribes against any form of economic monopoly, including that

---

<sup>1</sup> The exception was, of course, the presence of the Papuan slaves in the western part of the Archipelago, like the youngster who appeared in the illustrations in both Crawford’s HIA and in Raffles’s “History of Java”, and who were caught on a slaving expedition, like those referred to by G.W. Earl.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1856, p.405. Contrary to this assertion, S.K. Manickam has recently argued that slavery as a concept and as an institution actually was one of the determining factors in the manner in which the so-called eastern negroes were perceived; by perceiving them through the conceptual lenses of slavery, these peoples would pre-analytically be placed within an interpretive framework that prefigured the approaches and subsequent assessments of them. (Manickam 2009b, p.74-77)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford had already in 1820 expressed a similar opinion. (See HIA, Vol.III, p.43)

<sup>4</sup> The “British Review” first appeared in 1811, and it was intended as an alternative to the “Edinburgh Review” as well as the “Quarterly Review”, providing an evangelical viewpoint to the themes and texts discussed by these periodicals. It is in this light that the severe criticism against what was perceived as Crawford’s heretical polygenism should be assessed. (for more on the “British Review”, see Wellesley Index, XXXXXX)

<sup>5</sup> British Review, 1820, pp.328-330.

<sup>6</sup> Polygenism per se is *not* necessarily a corollary to linguistic polygenism. If language was considered to be a ‘rather late’ invention, like it was famously asserted by Ld. Monboddo (see e.g. Spadafora, and Beer, esp. pp.98-100), then a notion of linguistic polygenism did not entail any specific theory regarding the ultimate creation of man; this was an underdetermined issue then. As such it remained within Crawford’s discourse of *language matters*. In 1848 Crawford en passant mentioned that “since men are no more born with language than with mathematics – are born, in a word, only with a capacity to acquire both, equally branches of acquired language” Crawford 1848a, p.370; and in his article “On the Antiquity of Man from the Evidence of Language” (1863) Crawford thus claimed that: “It necessarily follows from what has now been stated, that man, when he first appeared on earth, *was destitute of language*. He had to frame one: *each tribe framed its own*, and hence the multitude of languages.” ... “The first rudiments of language must have consisted of a few articulate sounds, in the attempts made by *speechless but social savages*.” (Crawford 1863c, p.171)

<sup>7</sup> By the 1860s Crawford had become an explicit *racial polygenist*. In 1868, he commented upon the monogenetic theory, that “popular belief among the nations of Europe”, that “I believe this view to be contrary to nature, to be unsupported by historical facts, and to be against all probability”. (Crawford 1868a, p.49) See Part IV for more.

practised by his own employer the EIC, would undoubtedly have contributed to a reading of Crawford's publications as being those of an inveterate Radical.<sup>1</sup>

### 1.3.2 The Tensions between the Universal and the Particular in Languages.

However, despite being a much more outspokenly polygenist than Wilhelm von Humboldt ever was,<sup>2</sup> there would be no foundation for assuming that Crawford actually assumed that the most decisive diversity in the linguistic setup resulted from the polygenist origins of language. Indeed, it would have appeared rather inconsistent with the strict stadial approach and its inherent premise of universal comparability, if he had sided with Wilhelm von Humboldt in insisting on language being constitutive of thought rather than primarily representative of it.<sup>3</sup> There is thus no trace in Crawford's writings of neither the search for a time-transcending, 'primitive vitality' in the earliest linguistic enterprises, nor of an insistence on an autochthonous and to a certain extent incommensurable *Weltanschauung* ingrained in each particular language.<sup>4</sup> Compared with the tension between linguistic particularity and universality so flagrant in Wilhelm von Humboldt's analysis of language,<sup>5</sup> both in general and in his magnum opus of the Kawi language,<sup>6</sup> Crawford's approach was ubiquitously universal. Rather than ascribing the most primitive stage of language

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect the reception of Crawford's early publications appeared to have been quite similar to the one which befell upon Cuvier's British popularizer, the surgeon and comparative anatomist William Lawrence's (1783-1867) first texts and lectures with their articulation of an embryonic polygenism and published around the same time as Crawford's early publications; just like Crawford, Lawrence pleaded a fixist, racist stance, and yet still he condemned slavery in unequivocal terms. (Douglas & Ballard, pp.46-47 & p.60. See also Ellingson, e.g. pp.148-151 & 250-251)

<sup>2</sup> Although Wilhelm von Humboldt's typological analysis of language undoubtedly bordered on polygenism, he never, as stressed by Aarsleff, "openly addressed the problem of monogenesis versus polygenesis, but since it was well known – his brother, for instance, argued for polygenesis – it is safe to assume that he was familiar with it. His avoidance of it is therefore significant." (Aarsleff 1988, p.xxi).

<sup>3</sup> For general views of Humboldt's philosophy of language and its theoretical premises and implications, as well as their intellectual contexts, see e.g. Aarsleff 1988, pp.xvii-lxv; Aarsleff 1982, pp.335-355; Joseph 1999; Davies, pp.98-123; and Benes 2008, pp.54-63.

<sup>4</sup> It should here be noted that W. von Humboldt actually never seemed to fully ascribe to what later became known as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis which postulates that each language in its own particular way radically encodes its own cultural and cognitive categories in unique ways that in principle render these untranslatable to other languages (See e.g. Koerner 1992). On the contrary, despite his well known scientific analysis- and cultural appreciation of linguistic diversity, Wilhelm von Humboldt nonetheless "held that the form of all languages is essentially the same and their differences lie in the means they employ to express the common structure" (Aarsleff 1988, p.xix); not only did his approach still fall within the boundaries of the discourse formation associated with the debates on the scope and content of *universal grammar*, but he furthermore insisted on a hierarchic evaluation of the civilizational qualities of the various languages (and the typologies to which they belonged), and hence also of the nations who spoke them, along an absolute scale which posited Sanskrit as the most perfect and advanced language: the result was thus not linguistic relativism but absolutism (Aarsleff 1988, p.xxxii). Whereas Aarsleff was the perhaps foremost exponent of the approach that emphasized the influence of the French Ideologues and their interpretation of Condillac's philosophy of language upon W. von Humboldt (Benes 2008, p.21), another approach, championed by Koerner et al, focused more on how W. von Humboldt was influenced by the attempts in Germany to convert Kant's transcendental forms and categories into a philosophy of language, or, as especially evinced in the F. Bernhardt's "Theory of Language" (1801-1803), to accommodate these within the *universal grammar*, and then trace how these transcendentals occurred in the actual languages. (Benes 2008, pp.46-63. See also Reill and especially Vessey)

<sup>5</sup> Liebersohn, p.208.

<sup>6</sup> See also Errington 2008, pp.65-68, for an assessment of Humboldt's grand project within the context of colonial linguistics.

formation a pivotal function as the moment where the trajectories and civilizational potential was (pre)determined through the adapted typology of language, such as W. von Humboldt suggested, Crawford appeared to favour the assumption that this stage rather constituted a *tabula rasa*: an empty category – timeless and universal by being devoid of any characteristic traits of culture or historical heritage. At this stage of utter savagery all people and races around the world were equal in their misery,<sup>1</sup> in their absence of any vestiges of civilization.<sup>2</sup> Throughout his entire career Crawford continuously emphasized this aspect as constituting a universal feature of man, a lowest social common denominator shared by all, even though his later writings ever more strenuously stressed mankind's biological diversity, its ultimate polygenetic origins, and racial differences.

The universalistic focus rooted in Crawford's discourses on language matters did not, however, deter him from being critically aware of the danger of applying an inherently uniformizing approach that *a priori* would make the picture fit; – either by analytically turning the blind eye to any genuinely particular aspects of any given language, or, even worse, by distorting these beyond recognition due to the nature of preanalytically chosen conceptual tools. In the "Preliminary Dissertation" attached to his "Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language" (1852) Crawford thus chided the earlier grammars on Tagalog and the other Philippine languages, written by Spanish Missionaries, for not being congenial to the unique features in the structure of these languages. Instead of appreciating the fact that with "very few exceptions there is no class of words specially and exclusively verb in these languages", this expressive mode was instead being deformed "by the vain efforts of the Spanish grammarians to force it into a parallel with the Latin."<sup>3</sup>

J. Errington has pointed out some of the epistemological challenges and practical obstacles these Spanish friars cum linguists encountered when endeavouring to appropriate the native languages as part of a missionary and colonizing strategy devised to supplant their pagan ways of life.<sup>4</sup> They

---

<sup>1</sup> Referring to an account of the Australian Aborigines, Crawford wrote "of the miserable state of man at his first appearance on earth"; and this did not even truly encapsulate the initial state of nature since even the Aborigines, despite their abject way of life, had progressed significantly and possessed material artefacts such as rude weapons. (Crawford 1861a, p.155). The rhetoric invoked in this excerpt and its contexts are discussed at length in ch.17 in Ellingson, pp.290-302. Even their language was artificial and complex in its structure. (Crawford 1863c, p.171)

<sup>2</sup> Crawford stressed in 1861 that at the dawn of time "all races, wherever situated, were on a *common level of savage equality*" (Crawford 1861a, p.154, my italics)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cxi. Crawford may here have borrowed from Marsden who in 1834 stated that this was the case in "the grammars of the [Spanish] Jesuits, which are made to conform as nearly as possible to the scheme of Latin." (Marsden 1834, p.40) Crawford had already in 1820 expressed somewhat similar queries regarding the translation of European concepts of an abstract or generic nature into the languages of the Indian Archipelago, where, he claimed, such were almost absent. He here had stated that: "Whenever we press the languages of the oriental islands into our service on such occasions [expressing abstract notions], *we offer violence to their genius*. The people are strangers to the modes of expression in which such words are necessary, and when foisted into their language, the result is ambiguity or nonsense." (HIA, Vol.II, p.74; my italics)

<sup>4</sup> Errington 2008, p.23.

encountered many problems when faced with indigenous Philippine *practices of literacy*<sup>1</sup> which could only be incommensurately translated into their European counterparts. Errington was particularly occupied with the problems associated with devising a way to turn the practice of literacy expressed in the Tagalog script, ‘baybayin’, into sounds expressed through the Roman alphabet and then being capable of unequivocally decoding the meanings intended to be represented in these. The challenge here was double; not only did the Tagalog language possess sounds extremely difficult to capture with the letters of the Roman alphabet,<sup>2</sup> but even worse was the underdetermined nature of the script – no exact and unambiguous meaning could ever be maintained in it beyond the immediate contexts of its production.<sup>3</sup> Nor was this intended.<sup>4</sup> In the end, these orthographic gaps and the even more important the semantic gaps prompted the Spanish friars to abandon their quest of *mastering* the Tagalog practices of literacy expressed in the ‘baybayin’ script.<sup>5</sup> Instead they reverted to more familiar strategies of subjecting the orthographies of these languages to the sounds associated with the Roman alphabet – and thus regaining the authorial authority vested in the act of textual production.<sup>6</sup>

Comparing it unfavourably with the Javanese alphabet, Crawford later wrote of the Tagalog (“Tagala”) alphabet that it “has been described as a writing as easy to read as it is difficult to comprehend, because you always have to guess, both at sense and pronunciation. Examples have been given of a combination of the same letters which admit of seven, or even eight, different pronunciations and meanings, whereas in the Javanese alphabet, which has characters to represent every sound of the language, – in which every letter is pronounced, and in which the same letter has

---

<sup>1</sup> The notion of *practices of literacy* formed a key conceptual tool in Errington’s analysis; borrowing the concept of *practice* from Boudieu and M. de Certeau, Errington emphasized how it “frames literacy’s ‘particular manifestations’ as they are embedded in ‘activities, events, and ideological constructs’”. (Errington 2008, p.12)

<sup>2</sup> Or, to be more exact, the sounds associated with the letters of the alphabet; however, in linguistic discourses, both modern and historical ones, the term *letter* is often ascribed this double sense, as (1) referring “to a recurring pattern or type of sounds” and (2) serving as the name of a visually identifiable (alphabetical) symbol serving as the visual counterpart to the sound in question. (Errington 2008, p.33)

<sup>3</sup> That is, the importance of the so-called *authorial intention*, to use the M.P. Thomson’s term when discussing the problems involved in historical texts (Thompson, esp. pp.259-260 & 265-267); here, however, the problem of interpretation was much more radical because the notion of *text* was not the same within the two cultures, and hence the authorial intention would pose a much more controversial aspect. The similarities between this ‘baybayin’ and the inherently context-dependant language of the Yahoos in Borges’ “Brodie’s Report” are quite striking!

<sup>4</sup> Errington thus stressed that where “alphabetic [i.e. European] practices of literacy were bound to genres of historical writing and verbal art, those of baybayin were not. For Tagalogs, poetry and literature were celebrated and appreciated in oral performance [only]” (Errington 2008, p.44)

<sup>5</sup> The essential context-relatedness and the ingrained gaps of meaning in ‘baybayin’ would not merely open up for the possibility of an indigenous, subaltern appropriation of the texts produced by the Friars in this language, such as e.g. Bible translations; rather it would render such practices endemic, given that texts written in ‘baybayin’ could only possess a meaning when being *brought to life* by the radically interpretive act of the reader who thus was actually more performed than read the text. On the normal aspects of subaltern appropriations and counter-productions of the discourses associated with the linguistic projects of the colonial regimes, see Errington 2008, p.17.

<sup>6</sup> For a general discussion of the intellectual contexts, the theoretical background, and the linguistic strategies of these early modern Spanish missionary linguists and grammarians, see *Breva-Claramonte*.

always the same sound, a word can be pronounced in only one way.”<sup>1</sup> Crawford then attributed this glaring qualitative difference between the two alphabets to the variance in the obtained stage of civilization between the two societies; the higher civilized Javanese thus possessed a much more polished alphabet than the ruder inhabitants of the Philippine islands. Once more it was not cultural diversity as much as civilizational discrepancies that made up Crawford’s agenda!

Even so, Crawford intimated that linguistic structures of the Philippine languages still defied the attempt of classification rooted in a Latin and/or Greek model that not only prescribed how a grammatical structure *ought to be*, but also invariably, even if only unconsciously, *structured the approach ingrained in their descriptive analysis* of all languages, including these exotic ones. Yet this did not necessarily imply that Crawford here proved himself to be a thoroughbred linguistic relativist; in this approach he was merely following a general trend of challenging the hitherto undisputed authority vested in the Classical languages – both on the prescriptive and the descriptive level. The ‘discovery’ of the antiquity of Sanskrit and the value ascribed to it, qua its assumed originality and its function as the bearer of an ancient and grandiose civilization, as well as the nascent Indo-European theories, had spurred the contending of the normative authority of- and prescriptive validity hitherto vested in the study of the Classical languages on both the European Continent<sup>2</sup> and within the British cultural realm.<sup>3</sup>

Furthermore, Crawford’s own rhetorical agenda did most probably also influence his accentuation of this particular aspect. The critique of the unduly tendency of the Spanish grammarians to apply an a priori uniformizing analytical framework formed a part of a larger argument; here he intended to demonstrate that the indigenous languages spoken on the Philippine islands were in fact all different languages and not merely dialects of the same language, as it was claimed by these Spanish writers.<sup>4</sup> Intimating that the allegedly shared features of these Philippine languages actually were a product of the linguistic analysis, rather than a composing an innate part of the languages, would obviously serve to destabilize his opponents’ argument, and hence pave the way for his own. Crawford applied an identical rhetorical tactic in the case of the Languages of Madagascar, where he intended to show that they were not genealogically affiliated with Malay or any other of the languages of the Indian Archipelago. This, he claimed, could *inter alia*<sup>5</sup> be adduced from the fact that although the “grammatical structure of the Malagasi is simple, like that of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1856, p.210. (under the entry on ‘Language’)

<sup>2</sup> These aspects are covered in e.g. Benes 2008, ch.4, and in Marchand, ch2.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Burrow 1967 for an analysis of the entangled state of these issues in the British context.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1852a, pp. cxxviii-cxxix. This assertion formed an integrated part of Crawford’s larger argument of the vast diversity of different, genealogically unaffiliated, even if otherwise linked languages in the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia; this will be discussed at depth in last chapter in this Part.

<sup>5</sup> This was only *part* of the evidence which he adduced in support of his own hypothesis. (See Crawford 1852a, pp.cxlviii-clix.

Malay and Javanese, ... the simplicity is of a different character”, though;<sup>1</sup> in particular the verbs in the Malagasi language were of a very complex structure – there were thus not less than 13 different kinds of verbs. Out of these “The missionaries make the Malagasi verbs to have three moods, an indicative, an imperative, and an infinitive”.<sup>2</sup> By using the word *make* Crawford seemed to have ascribed a certain element of constructivism in the practice of these French and British missionaries;<sup>3</sup> again this could be interpreted as a rhetorical tactic of weakening the opposing argument by pointing to a methodological bias inherent in the evidence adduced in support this.<sup>4</sup>

As demonstrated in the case of Crawford, a polygenist approach did not ineluctably imply linguistic relativism and a focus on the particular. Neither did a strict monogenism automatically lead to the assumption of universally shared linguistic traits on the most fundamental level. J.D. Lang thus claimed that even though “the sacred writer had left it on record that *God had made of one blood all the nations of men*, the phenomena of language would have remained unexplained and inexplicable”;<sup>5</sup> or, in other words, the dogma of monogenism regarding the origin of mankind could not be seamlessly extrapolated to the linguistic realm. Indeed, Lang sought to embed the sort of fundamental linguistic diversity normally associated with either an explicit or a more latent, but nonetheless lingering, linguistic polygenism<sup>6</sup> within his Biblical framework of monogenism, of original perfectibility, and of subsequent degeneration. He thus insisted that:

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, p.cl; on p.cxxxvii he had stated exactly the same about the grammatical structure of the Polynesian languages.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1852a, p.cl.

<sup>3</sup> Errington 2008, pp.100-102; here he described how some of these British missionaries during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. collaborated with king Radama and later Queen Ranavalona in order to produce a uniform Malagasi orthography and an English-Malagasi dictionary, expressed in the Roman alphabet. This can be seen as an attempt to construct a unified *practice of literacy* in the Malagasi language which again formed an integrated part of the process of building a nation state through construing *imagined communities* characterizing so much of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., here as well as in Europe. Errington listed some of the epistemological challenges involved in this project: “The writing of this dictionary involved practices of literacy which required a particular kind of “meaning” to create word-to-word relations between elements of English and Imerina [Malagasi]. Isolating and juxtaposing elements of alien and familiar languages in written lists required that there exist a kind of lowest common denominator of meaning. Only by assuming that a unitary “semantic field” underlay both languages could missionaries bridge enormous gaps between social imaginaries.” (pp.101-102). In 1835 J.J. Freeman, who had been sent as a missionary to that island by the London Missionary Society (LMS), published his “Dictionary of the Malagasy Language”; in the dedication Freeman emphasized how the missionaries sent by the LMS had introduced the art of printing to that island (Freeman 1835)

<sup>4</sup> However, even if my accentuation of Crawford’s use of the word *make* (instead of more passive terms like *identify*, *observe*, etc.) is pertinent, it still remains uncertain whether Crawford ascribed this *distortive approach* (1) to their *ideological prefigured approach of Universal Grammar*, or whether it was (2) due to an epistemological necessity inherently ingrained in the process of ‘translating’ the fundamental structure of one language into a markedly different one. It would only serve the rhetorical purpose sketched above, if he intended the first interpretation; as mentioned before, there is, however, nothing else in Crawford’s discourses on language that suggests that he ever entertained a truly relativist stance, such as the one intimated in the latter interpretation.

<sup>5</sup> Lang 1834, p.213; the italics were Lang’s own.

<sup>6</sup> As stressed by Eco, in his analysis of de Maistre’s linguistic theories, the notion of *genius of languages* always “recalls that of polygenesis, or at least of autonomous development, unreconcilable with any monogenetic hypothesis.” (Eco 1998, pp.103-104)



“I apprehend it utterly impossible to refer the languages of the remoter east to that common origin, or to account for the total absence of all analogy in their structure and formation to the languages of the west, on any other hypothesis, than that God, who had made of one blood, and of *one lip* or language, all the nations of men, was pleased, for the wise and beneficent purpose declared by the sacred writer, suddenly to confound the speech of men, so that one tribe or division of the human family found itself thenceforth using a language constructed on totally different principles from those of the rest of mankind, and consequently unintelligible to all but themselves. These fundamental principles, that distinguish one family of languages from another, and that seem to have been the result of some immediate acting of Divinity on the intellect of particular tribes of men”.<sup>1</sup>

The “fundamental principles” referred to here had earlier been determined to be composed of linguistic structure and grammatical forms rather than merely by the analogy of their sounds and of their roots.<sup>2</sup> Upon this methodological<sup>3</sup> foundation Lang identified 3 large “divisions” of the languages “spoken by the various tribes of mankind”, viz. (I) “The Eastern or Mongolian language”,<sup>4</sup> (II) “The Western, or Caucasian, language”,<sup>5</sup> and (III) “The Southern, or Ethiopic, language”.<sup>6</sup> The Semitic languages, and perhaps the Slavic (“Sclavonic”) ones as well, were, on the other hand, considered to be “the result of an early admixture of the Eastern and Western tongues”, facilitating “a connecting link between them”.<sup>7</sup> Hence, according to Lang, the decisive divide did not exist between the dynamic and civilizing languages of the Indo-European stock on the one hand and the petrified, monotheistic inclined Semitic on the other, the divide which have been so lucidly

<sup>1</sup> Lang 1834, 214; Lang’s own italics.

<sup>2</sup> Lang 1834, p.147. Lang was here quoting A. von Humboldt’s “Personal Narrative” (the publication of the English edition of this gargantuan work began in 1814; vol.3, from which this quotation was taken was first published in 1819) in which A. von Humboldt evidently drew upon his brother’s expertise in linguistic matters (see also p.300 of this volume for Alexander’s expression of his debt to his brother in these questions)

<sup>3</sup> Lang 1834, p.152.

<sup>4</sup> Lang 1834, pp.150-153. The division included the “dialects of Eastern Tartary”, Chinese, Indo-Chinese, Malayan, and the Indo-American languages; to these there should perhaps be added Coptic, or ancient Egyptian, and Magyar. With the important exception of Chinese, and perhaps Indo-Chinese too, this division corresponded roughly to the one which Baron Bunsen and Max Müller later denominated *Turanian* (a term Bunsen claimed to have borrowed from Heeren and Carl Ritter), and which was defined as the residual languages belonging to the *Japhetic stock* but not forming a part of the Indo-European/Indo-German/Iranian family (see e.g. Bunsen’s essay in *Bunsen, Meyer, & Max Müller* and Max Müller’s disquisition on “The last Results of the Researches respecting Non-Iranian and Non-Semitic Languages of Asia and Europe, or the Turanian family of languages” in *Bunsen 1854*, Vol.III, pp.263-486. On these texts and their context, see *Stocking 1987*, pp.56-62 and *Driem*, pp.227-233.

<sup>5</sup> Lang 1834, pp.154-157. This division was composed of the following subgroups: Sanscrit, Persian, Celtic, Teutonic, Pelasgic (Latin and Greek); despite using Blumenbach’s terminology of *Caucasian*, normally more associated with race in a biological than in a linguistic sense, this division was nevertheless in as well content as definition congruent with the groups associated with *Indo-German* (Klaproth), *Aryan* (Lassen and Max Müller) and *Indo-European* (Young)

<sup>6</sup> Lang 1834, pp.157-159. This division was composed of languages spoken in two, geographically divided, zones – the “dialects of the African, or South Western, negroes” and those of the “Papuan, or South Eastern, negroes”. This class was evidently composed of a residual set, clearly more linked by attributed (biologically determined) racial traits than by linguistic features the knowledge of which, according to the writer himself, was of a “limited nature”.

<sup>7</sup> Lang 1834, p.157.

analysed by M. Olender.<sup>1</sup> Instead, his analytical gaze was here more upon an allegedly divinely occasioned, linguistically typological binary between the Mongolian class of languages, which seemed to be “radically and originally monosyllabic and inflexible in its character”, and the “essentially polysyllabic and flexile Caucasian, languages.”<sup>2</sup> Although only referring to English translations of German texts, and in this context in particular to the linguistic elements contained in Helen Maria Williams’s edition of A. von Humboldt’s “Personal Narrative” (1814-1829), Lang demonstrated an intimate knowledge of the main tenets involved in the newer historical-comparative philology which in particular prospered in Germany.<sup>3</sup> The binary was established between, on the one hand, the Indo-European stock – characterized by inflexion in the conjugation of their verbs – and on the other a more amorphous, residual group of languages; the latter was primarily defined by what its content did not possess, i.e. an organic organization and inflective structure. This interpretation had been instigated with F. Schlegel who, as it is well known, had acquired his knowledge of Sanskrit from the Scottish Orientalist A. Hamilton when the latter was stranded in Paris after the breakdown of the Peace of Amiens.<sup>4</sup> The subsequent works on linguistics by e.g. F. Bopp<sup>5</sup> and J. Klaproth<sup>6</sup> only served to underpin it further, notwithstanding their methodological innovations and interpretive discrepancies. Whereas F. Schlegel initially had ascribed this division to a fundamental divergence between the God-given, perfect organic languages and the group of naturally developed, more primitive languages, and then had inscribed these in a polygenetic framework, he had later, just like Lang was to do in 1834, transferred these theories into a strictly monogenetic Biblical framework.<sup>7</sup>

These few examples, and the sketch of their interwoven contexts, should amply illustrate the wide variety of interpretive frameworks available to the student of the intersected questions of human origin, its early history, and the racial as well as linguistic diversity; theology, ethnology,

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Olender 2002*. An interesting point, which Lang did not dwell further on here, regarded the theological status of Hebrew – if Hebrew, like the other Semitic languages, was the result of an admixture of the original Mongol and Caucasian stocks, then the authority often vested in Hebrew due to its *assumed primordial character*, and hence its attributed pristine qualities, would be refuted; this could evidently be interpreted as being at odds with the instinctive and uncritical authenticity of the Scriptures which Lang e.g. ascribed to the stories of the Flood. However, I have not found any reviews of Lang’s book which touch upon this aspect.

<sup>2</sup> *Lang 1834*, p.155.

<sup>3</sup> And which was also being debated vividly in contemporary British periodicals and journals.

<sup>4</sup> See *Rendall*.

<sup>5</sup> Bopp who best known for his path breaking *comparative grammar* approach (1816), and who, as mentioned earlier, was remarkably disinclined for his own time towards drawing cultural-, racial-, or overtly historical inferences upon linguistic data, did however champion a tripartite division of languages based upon their typology: (1) the utterly inorganic and grammarless monosyllabic languages; (2) the organic *Indo-Classical* (Bopp’s preferred term equivalent to *Indo-European* which he himself adopted from 1857 [*Benes 2008*, p.312]) languages; (3) disyllabic Semitic languages. (*Benes 2008*, pp.82-83)

<sup>6</sup> Even though Klaproth primarily worked within the methodological confines of the ‘Word List’ and only superficially involved grammar on this level, his theoretical superstructure nonetheless operated with a linguistically and racially conflated division between the Indo-Germanic and the other languages – e.g. resulting in a two-race theory regarding the ethnic composition of the Indian subcontinent. (*Benes 2008*, pp.83-88)

<sup>7</sup> *Benes 2008*, pp.71-76.

history, and philology were intricately intertwined on all levels of this knowledge production. Monogenism and polygenism, both in terms human and linguistic origins, did not represent discrete dialectical opposites, divided by impermeable bulkheads, as much as composing the extremes within sliding scales of conceptual combinatorics, offering a vast array of investigative strategies and explanative modes other than merely one of stringent monogenism, whether divinely ordained or in a secular version, and a polygenetic one preaching a hardcore racist view of mankind and its tongues.

### 1.3.3 Crawford and His Philosophical Sources.

Crawford did not often reveal his stance on the more philosophical issues that ensued in the wake of the contemporary philological debates. This does not imply that these questions did not permeate the texts produced by Crawford or the very approach that rendered them possible; rather, this silence appeared to be the result of writing within a genre of colonial linguistics, with a focus on a narrower thematic contexts that did not necessarily include questions regarding the ultimate origin- and purpose of language. In this aspect Crawford's texts resembled Marsden's and Raffles's.

#### 1.3.3.1 Consuming, Appropriating, and Occluding Horne Tooke's Theories and Approaches.

Crawford, however, did refer to Horne Tooke and his "Diversions of Purley" on a few occasions. Although never venturing out in the excesses of the kind of wild etymologies so characteristic of Tooke's approach, Crawford did take one of Tooke's teachings to his heart, and it was to Tooke's writings that he attributed the idea that shared *particles* was the surest sign of common origin of languages. In the part dedicated to the study of language in HIA, Crawford thus professed that the most adequate manner to identify a shared linguistic affinity was:

"This is most remarkable in the class of words connected with the metaphysical structure of language, and which, from their very nature, did not admit of being displaced by foreign words, such as the substantive and auxiliary verbs; the prepositions representing the most abstract of the relations of cases; the termination representing a possessive case, and the inseparable particles representing a passive and a transitive signification of the verb; and perhaps, *above all, the common class of particles.*"<sup>1</sup>

Thus was followed by a footnote quoting at length from "Diversions of Purley"<sup>2</sup> on the theoretical and methodological importance of particles in a linguistic analysis.<sup>3</sup> Even though the importance of H. Tooke's work today has received something of a reappraisal, not at least due to Aarsleff's path breaking analysis, not much research has been dedicated to Tooke's influence upon

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.81; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Without its author, H. Tooke, ever being mentioned explicitly; apparently this was not even deemed necessary.

<sup>3</sup> See also Aarsleff 1966/1983, p.58

linguistic studies within the colonial context and the use of the evidence thus procured in the fields of history, antiquarianism, and ethnology. To my knowledge this aspect has only been touched upon by T.R. Trautmann.<sup>1</sup> In the article “Dr. Johnson and the Pandits: Imagining the Perfect Dictionary in Colonial Madras” (2001),<sup>2</sup> Trautmann argued that the EIC civil servant and orientalist F.W. Ellis in the 1810s, during his ‘discovery’ of the Dravidian language family as an autonomous linguistic entity,<sup>3</sup> not only drew upon the approaches delineated by Sir William Jones, but “was also partial to Horne Tooke’s etymological writings, a combination of tendencies somewhat at odds with what Aarsleff’s study might lead one to predict”.<sup>4</sup> Even if being incompatible on the conceptual level, Ellis nonetheless apparently abided by this combination of theoretical and methodological elements in his practical approach. It seemed that Crawford shared this propensity towards an eclectic approach with Ellis; the theories on the dissemination of language, civilization, and nations in the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia, as well the linguistic evidence he adduced in support of these, ought to be assessed in the light of this knowledge. If Marsden’s approach and theorizing was reminiscent of the ‘New Philology’ associated with Sir William Jones, and if Lang’s somewhat eccentric, Biblical theory claimed to be supported by linguistic evidence partly produced within a framework of newer German philology, then Crawford’s linguistic discourse included, even though it never relied solely on, a third strand – one that, at least in Crawford’s mental mould, resulted in a much narrower definition of what constituted a linguistic, genealogical affinity. The implications of this were twofold: combined with his fundamentally polygenetic linguistic orientation 1) it limited the explanatory scope of the genealogical framework, and hence, in lieu of this, 2) recourse had to be taken to other explanatory modes; such one was provided to Crawford by the model of an entwined dissemination of civilization and its accompanying linguistic elements through travel, trade, conquest, and colonization. So, even if Tooke’s theories on the importance of the particles within linguistic theory may not have necessarily constituted the ulterior rationale for Crawford’s linguistic, ethnological, and racial theories, they nonetheless provided him with the linguistic evidence that facilitated these hypotheses and helped framing their finer grained setup.

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Rendall did also discuss the influence of the political, ideological, and scholarly debates following in the wake of Tooke’s theories upon the British intellectual environment in general, and hence also upon the approaches and theories of the scholars belonging to what she had termed the *Scottish orientalism*; yet, although emphasizing that “most of the writers here were aware of, and interested in, the debate between these two points of view, between Tooke and James Mill on the one hand, and [Dugald] Stewart and Sir William Jones on the other”, her analytical interest was mainly directed towards its influence upon A. Murray’s “History of the European Languages” (1823), published posthumously, and which mainly dealt with a non-orientalistic topic. (Rendall, pp.51-52; see also Aarsleff 1966/1983, pp.81-88)

<sup>2</sup> originally published in *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 38:4 (2001), pp.375-397; republished in Trautmann 2009a, pp.112-136.

<sup>3</sup> This ‘discovery’ by Ellis and the aspect of his corroboration with South Indian pandits in this process, where these acted as both information gatherers and knowledge producers compose the central themes in Trautmann 2006.

<sup>4</sup> Trautmann 2009a, p.120.

Crawfurd repeated this debt to Tooke in his article on “The Countries, Nations, and Languages of the Oceanic Region” from 1834. After reviewing Marsden’s most recent publication, its theoretical framework, and its main hypotheses, Crawfurd maintained that: “We agree entirely with Horne Tooke, in thinking that it is to the particles that we ought to look for the common origin of languages. Let the East-Insular languages then be tried by this test, which has not yet been applied to them, and see what will be the result.”<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd reiterated this assertion in 1848, although this time without mentioning Tooke.<sup>2</sup>

1834 was, in fact, the last time that Crawfurd referred to Tooke as a source of his linguistic analysis. When he in 1852 published his most ambitious and sophisticated work on linguistic themes, “The Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay language” with its accompanying “Preliminary Dissertation”, it was devoid of any explicit references to Tooke or his texts. Yet, ironically, it was even more replete with reminiscences of these theories than any of the earlier texts; the importance vested in the particles and kindred lexical elements as constituting the definitive criterion when determining a genealogical affinity between languages became codified, and it was consistently applied in the linguistic analysis. As a counter theory to Marsden’s criterion of identity in the terms expressing allegedly shared *simple ideas*, Crawfurd stated that the decisive test should be sought on the level of the sentence: “If *a sentence* can be constructed by *words of the same origin*, in two or more languages, such languages may safely be considered as sister tongues, – to be, in fact, dialects, or to have sprung from the same stock.”<sup>3</sup> It was then contended that the “words which appear to me most fit to test the unity of languages are those indispensable to their structure, – which constitute, as it were, their framework, and without which they cannot be spoken or written. These are the prepositions which represents the cases of languages of complex structure, and the auxiliaries which represent times and moods.”<sup>4</sup> To these words the group of particles was repeatedly added in the analysis of the various languages spoken in the Indian Archipelago, the Philippines, and the Pacific realm.<sup>5</sup> In spite of refuting the validity of the relatively simple and mechanical analysis associated with the methodology of the ‘Word List’ as propagated by Marsden, and despite actually conducting rather thorough grammatical analyses whenever the available source-material allowed it, Crawfurd’s linguistic approach still remained within the confines of a more mechanistic view of

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1834*, p.396.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawfurd 1848a*, p.363.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, p.vi; my italics. It can be argued whether this definition was not actually an instance of *begging the question*. At least it seemed to involve a *petitio principii* inference, unless there should exist some way of positively and validly assessing their *common origin* outside of this test!

<sup>4</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, pp.v-vi. See also *Crawfurd 1856*, p.212, for almost verbatim repetitions of these ideas.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Crawfurd 1852a*, pp.xiv, xxvii, lxx, lxxii, lxxxviii, cxix, cxxiii, cxxvii-cxxxviii, cxliii, clii, clxvi, & clxxxi. The following is a fairly representative example: “The difference in the auxiliaries and particles seems to show clearly that the Sunda, although much intermixed with the Malay and Javanese, is in reality a distinct language from either of them. Without its native auxiliaries and particles a sentence of it could not be spoken or written; its foreign ingredients, therefore although numerous are extrinsic.” (p.lxx)

language. This can, in part, be explained by the nature of the languages studied here; Crawford concurred with earlier writers in the assertion that these languages were not of an inflexional structure like the Indo-European languages. This allegedly rendered a comparison of the grammatical structures a less apt method of assessing the genealogical affinity. Regarding “a supposed similarity of grammatical structure”, Crawford stated that to “this last test, chiefly relied on by late German writers, I am not disposed to attach much weight, when applied to languages of remarkably simple structure, affording necessarily few salient points for comparison”.<sup>1</sup> However, Crawford’s commitment to a materialist conceptualization of civilization and his firm footing in the Radical camp would probably also have contributed to an analytical approach which prepossessed the *mechanistic* aspects of languages over the more *organic* ones.

It can only be surmised what actually prompted Crawford to not refer to Tooke and his theories even though he, as demonstrated, continued to be inspired by them. That Tooke’s theories came to be viewed as rather obsolete in an increasingly more specified scientific context could perhaps explain that Crawford’s occluded his debt to Tooke by 1852. A change in genre would possibly offer another contributive factor; by the time of the publication of HIA in 1820, Crawford had previously written on topics related to China and the Indian Archipelago in the *Edinburgh Review*, and the ideological intensions with this three-volume work were as transparent as his aspirations of fashioning himself as an informed scholar-administrator and authority. The article from 1834 was published in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, a periodical which at this moment was associated with both Whig and with Benthamite Radicals,<sup>2</sup> and at a time when he was unsuccessfully running for Parliament as a Radical. In other words, whereas references to Tooke before may have seemed to offer an opportune rhetorical strategy, they had by 1852 probably become more of a liability, compromising instead of bolstering his arguments.

Even long after the paradigm of ‘New Philology’ had firmly established its hegemony and had been instrumental in the foundation of philology as a prestigious science in Europe, and particularly on the Continent,<sup>3</sup> reminiscences of earlier theories continued to linger on in the affiliated fields, such as ethnology as well as the history of the earliest times and in extra-European settings.<sup>4</sup> These

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, p.iv.

<sup>2</sup> Houghton, Vol.II, p.131. As a result of editorial changes, the journal shortly after became “ultra-Tory”. (p.133)

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. F.W. Farrar’s comment from 1869: “On the Continent philologists have long been regarded as belonging to the fraternity of scientific men. In England their claim, though longer resisted, is now frankly and generously acknowledged. And, indeed, whatever definition of science we may feel inclined to accept, it is hard to see how we can refuse that illustrious name to the treasury of results which have been attained by inquiries into the nature and laws of human speech.” And the positivistic intent was later made explicit when stating that: “But Philology like its sister sciences, rose from these metaphysical and empiric stages to the acquisition of scientific methods and positive results.” (Farrar, p.252 & p.253). For more on Farrar’s contributions to the discussions on philology, see Burrow 1967, pp.190-193, and Alter 1999, pp.91-96.

<sup>4</sup> However, neither did Tooke’s influence altogether disappear in the English context after the ascendancy of the paradigm of ‘New Philology’, even though it became much diluted. (See e.g. Aarsleff 1966/1983, p.238)

theories doubtlessly continued to exert an influence upon both the scientific and ideological assessments of these regions, and the imperial gaze was in the end moulded in the light of the rationale provided through such means.

### 1.3.3.2 Adam Smith: Complexities of Language, and Levels of Abstraction.

In his writings on language and ethnology in the 1860s, Crawford once more invoked an 18<sup>th</sup> C. figure; this time it was his famous compatriot Adam Smith. Here he referred to the Smith's "Considerations Concerning the First Formation of Languages" (1767), a thirty odd pages long essay usually attached to "The Theory of Moral Sentiments".<sup>1</sup> In the article "On the Antiquity of Man from the Evidence of Language", Crawford invoked Smith's theories on particular three points: 1) all languages are divided into two classes, those subjected to inflexional conjugations, the *complex* ones, and the *simple* ones which are not; 2) the simple ones are created from the complex ones as a product of intermixture of nations speaking different languages; 3) the origin and developments of languages per se was the story of growth from simplicity towards increasing complexity, beginning with names of simple objects, nouns substantive, and then developing into all other classes of words.<sup>2</sup> Only on point 2 did Crawford dissent from Smith's analysis – although emblematic for the development of modern English, this trajectory should not be elevated to the status of a generally valid rule.<sup>3</sup> Just like W. von Humboldt<sup>4</sup>, Crawford stated that:

"It appears to me that the structural character which languages originally assumed would in a great measure be fortuitous, that is, it would depend on the whim or fancy of the first rude founders. Some tongues would start with monosyllabic, and some with polysyllabic words, some with simple and some with a complex structure, and having done so, those who spoke them would persevere from mere habit."<sup>5</sup>

Unlike Humboldt, though, Crawford did not seem to attach much importance to this initial formation of linguistic typology; thus, he did not ascribe it a pivotal importance as a factor either contributing to- or impairing the progress of civilization.

---

<sup>1</sup>For further on Smith's theories on language and their contexts, see *Berry and Land*.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1863c*, pp.173-178. See also the excerpt of this Paper presented at the Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Manchester in 1861 (published in *BAAS*, Vol.31, pp.191-193).

<sup>3</sup> Writing on the *simple* structure of the languages spoken in the Indian, or Malay and Philippine, Archipelago Crawford thus ascertained that: "there is no evidence to show that their simplicity of form has arisen from the breaking down of ancient languages of complex structure, for no vestige of such complex language is discoverable." (Under the entry of 'Language' in *Crawford 1856*, p.207) The placing of the *burden of proof* here is quite indicative of Crawford's approach; the absence of positive evidence of such a connection was here interpreted as sufficient to refute this theory.

<sup>4</sup> See *Aarsleff 1988*, pp.xxi-xxxii; the different language typologies were, according to Humboldt, instigated at the very moment of the first, initial articulation; only later did the development become subject to universal laws, but the particular structures inherent in the languages from the very beginning would determine its future potential. This potential of each language depended on the circumstances of the unique initial moment in which they were first created.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawford 1863c*, p.175.

Regarding the idea that language originally represented only simple objects and then in time grew in complexity and abstraction, Crawfurd argued that, even if true, it would not have any value in empirical studies of contemporary, or of documented historical, languages. “However great the difficulties of constructing languages, there is no doubt that they were all conquered, and conquered too, by mere savages. Language was even *brought to perfection, as to structure, and for the expression of all ordinary ideas*, by men who were, at best, barbarians.”<sup>1</sup> Yet, even though complexity *on the structural level* could be perceived a universal standard nowadays, this did not impede the detection of what Crawfurd called a “*poverty of language*”<sup>2</sup> among many less civilized societies. In this article he referred such elements as 1) a lack of *divisions of time* and 2) unrefined stages in the processual formation of *numbers*;<sup>3</sup> earlier he had also focussed on the general *ability to form the generic terms* – used to denominate sets of elements assumed to possess shared essential features – as evincing a certain sign of-, and as implying, civilizational progress. In his analysis of the Javanese language, i.e. the language of the most civilized nation in the Indian Archipelago, in HIA, he had sweepingly asserted that:

“The Javanese language is not less remarkable for its copiousness in some respects than for its meagreness and poverty in others. *In unimportant trifles, it deals in the most puerile and endless distinctions, while, in matters of utility, not to say in matters of science, it is utterly defective. These characters of the language belong to the peculiar state of society which exists among the people of Java*, which I shall endeavour to illustrate, by entering at some length upon the subject.

There are two sources of copiousness in the Javanese language, one resulting from the natural tendency of this language, and perhaps of most other semi-barbarous tongues, to degenerate into redundancy, and the other from political causes. In the first case, it descends to the slenderest ramifications of distinction, often more resembling the elaborate arrangements of science than the common language of the world. It wantons in exuberance, when species, varieties, and individuals are described, – while *no skill is displayed in combining and generalizing*. Not only are *names for the more general abstractions usually wanting*, as in the words fate, space, nature, &c. but the language shows *the utmost deficiency in common generic names*. There are, for example, two names for each of the metals, and three for some; but not one for the whole class, – not a word equivalent to metal or mineral. There exists no word for animal, expressing the whole class of living creatures.

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd 1863c, p.178; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd 1863c, p.173.

<sup>3</sup> Crawfurd 1863c, p.173 & p.177. See also Crawfurd 1863b which quoted Smith on numerals being “among the most abstract ideas which the human mind is capable of forming”. (p.84)



The genera of beasts, birds, insects, and reptiles are but indifferent expressed; but for the individuals of each class there is the usual superfluity, five names, for example, for a dog; six for a hog and elephant, and seven for a horse.

The disposition to generalize which appears in every polished language, and so discoverable in the structure of almost every sentence, is, in short, a stranger to the Javanese. It is fitted for the language of pure description, of the passions, or of familiar life, but wholly defective when any degree of subtlety or abstraction is implied, as may well be expected in the language of a simple and semi-barbarous people.”<sup>1</sup>

This mode of inference was a relic not only of A. Smith, but also of the general analysis of exotic languages in the 18<sup>th</sup> C.. Only by premising the existence of a kind of lowest common denominator of meaning between all languages, by asserting the presence of an assumed conceptual congruence (extending at least to such generic ideas as referred to above<sup>2</sup>), would such an approach make sense. Only then could an absence of generic ideas be inferred from an (observed) absence of any terms expressing these; and only then could this absence of generic ideas be perceived as a sign of a relative absence of civilization.

This, however, engendered some of the same problems regarding how to define and devise the supposedly objective categories referred to by these generic terms which had faced the creators of the so-called *a priori philosophical languages* in the 17<sup>th</sup> C., and of whom John Wilkins is the most renowned.<sup>3</sup> The assumptions of shared and objective semantic fields were particularly prone to be challenged when faced with other cultures, the languages of which expressed apparently contradictory categorizations and sometimes offered quite unfathomable rationales for these. This is perhaps most famously illustrated in the innate and all too apparent arbitrariness involved in the categorization contained in the apocryphal Chinese dictionary mentioned in J.L. Borges’s famous

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp.7-9; my italics. See also pp.73-74 for a similar interpretation regarding the general state of the languages in the region: “In all the more improved tongues we discover, throughout, the same redundancy of expression on familiar subjects, and the same poverty on higher and more abstract ones. ... but for *abstract words, particularly such as relate to the operations of the mind, and which are familiar in the most barbarous ages of European languages*, the deficiency of every one of the Polynesian [here referring to all of the *original and* autochthonous languages in the Indian Archipelago] is pitiable.” (my italics) Contrasting the Polynesian languages to even “the most barbarous ages of European languages” could signify that Crawford either (1) ascribed the Polynesian languages an even more primitive stage than these, or (2) it meant that there existed an inherent, and civilizationally significant, difference between the European languages on the one hand and Polynesian (or perhaps all Oriental) languages on the other. At this stage Crawford had not yet explicitly rejected the idea of an Indo-European language family characterized by, among other elements, its inflectional typology; given the existence of such theories of an essential superiority of the Indo-European languages it cannot be excluded that Crawford nurtured such ideas as well, but, considering the general tenor of his theoretical approach, it seems more probable that he intended to convey the former argument of a stadial difference.

<sup>2</sup> Which in this case, however, primarily were constrained to only referring to natural phenomena or their more immediate cultural derivatives. Hence they belonged to the language of *physical reality* rather than to that of *culture, value, and belief*; as such, it could be claimed that the generic terms for these belonged to the realm of the *realistic* – and thus objectively given, universally valid – ideas, while a *nominalist* approach could be pleaded just as well as a realistic one for the notions designating cultural aspects. (See Paxman 1993, p.20 & p.23)

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Eco 1995, pp.238-259; Aarsleff 1982, pp.239-277; and Simone pp.170-176.

essay on John Wilkins's analytical language, and which was so cogently reiterated in Foucault's preface to the "The Order of Things".<sup>1</sup>

Yet, even if one presupposed the existence of a common conceptual ground, and if one added to this the heuristic assumption that the gained knowledge of the foreign language was sufficiently exhaustive (which it, in the case of unsubdued and exotic peoples, in reality hardly ever was!), then another obstacle appeared: did an observed lack of, for instance, such generic terms in these exotic languages necessarily reveal an absence of corresponding ideas of these (assumed real) categories, – with this implying a lack of mental refinement demonstrated through the lack of a capacity for abstraction, and hence also a lack of civilizational refinement? Or, would it be possible that a fundamentally common and universally shared sphere of ideas was expressible in other ways than merely by isolating each discrete idea and reducing its expression to a single term only? Would it not be thinkable that identical ideas (and a corresponding ability of abstraction) actually existed in the minds of these exotic people, even though they were not expressed by isolated terms in their languages? Perhaps they could instead be articulated through other modes of speech! D.B. Paxman has studied how these questions vexed 18<sup>th</sup> C. philosophical travellers like Lafiteau and La Condamine, as well as the sedentary, system-building philosophers like Condillac, Maupertuis, and Herder. At heart lay the tensions and connections between the aspects of universality and difference, and whether these were deeply embedded in the modes of thought, or whether they mainly reigned in the more superficial modes of expression.<sup>2</sup> This affected the notions regarding the possibilities and methods of transcultural translations which again, as shown in the case of Crawfurd, influenced the assessment of- and attitudes towards these societies.

The rather dismissive allegations of the lack of practical refinement and the excess of wearisome copiousness ingrained in the Javanese language were *not* repeated in 1852, in the more careful and detailed analysis of both the popular, polite, and ancient forms of Javanese<sup>3</sup> in the "Grammar and Dictionary of Malay". Instead, this state of absence of civilized refinement, indicated by the combination of redundancy in trifling details and generic poverty, had by now been spatially relocated to the languages of Philippines.<sup>4</sup> Crawfurd thus claimed that: "The languages of the Philippine Islands may be described, not as copious, but wordy. *In the state of society in which the natives of the Philippines were formed, ideas are considered more in concrete than in abstract*, and by an importance being attached to trivial matters, a profusion springs up, which, in a more advanced state of society, are considered, unworthy of retention, or which, if retained, would only

---

<sup>1</sup> Foucault 1999, p.24.

<sup>2</sup> I here refer to Paxman 1993.

<sup>3</sup> Also referred to as the *daily language*, the *ritual language*, and the *Kawi* immortalised by W. von Humboldt.

<sup>4</sup> This was reiterated in Crawfurd 1863c, p.173.

be productive of perplexity and distraction.”<sup>1</sup> After having produced several examples in support of this assertion – like, for instance, having 12 different names for *coco-nut* but none for *tree*, or possessing 40 words describing the act or contexts of eating but none to denominate the verb itself – he then inferred:

“The absence, in the two leading Philippine languages of such generic terms as these now enumerated, *indicates a rude state of society and language among the Philippine islanders* previous to their intercourse with the more advanced nations of the western part of the Indian Archipelago; and points, at the same time, to the cause which gave rise to the introduction of a considerable class of Malay and Javanese words. *As society advanced, generic terms became convenient or indispensable*, and seem to have been adopted from the first obvious source that presented itself<sup>2</sup>, instead of being invented.”<sup>3</sup>

This approach formed an aspect of continuity in Crawford’s discourse on linguistic matters; the fundamental assumption that the progress of civilization could be read as a growth in conceptual abstraction in language seemed ubiquitous in his discourses on linguistic matters, as well as in the discourses of many other contemporary scholars, travellers, and colonial administrators.<sup>4</sup> It is only on this background that the adventures enjoyed by Borges’s fictitious missionary-linguist David Brodie amongst the Yahoos/Mlch appear so strikingly exotic. This was particularly striking when faced with an utterly primitive state of society and a corresponding simplicity in the monosyllabic language, in which, however, each savage sound nevertheless articulated a *general idea* on the most abstract level; – and exotic specifically because it defied the expectations of the reader already familiar with the usual topoi in travel writing and colonial discourses.

The universalist and progressionist framework, with which this conceptual commonplace was intimately entwined, ascribed to the arriving colonialists the rhetorical role as, if not the masters of the universe then at least the masters of the universals: – as those who, through their superior mental and accompanying linguistic capabilities, could create worded order out of erratic chaos, whose

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, pp.cxix-cxx; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> That is, from the Malay, or subsidiary Javanese, spoken by the most civilized societies with whom the societies speaking the Philippine languages held a regular intercourse.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1852a, pp.cxxvi-cxxviii; the italics are mine.

<sup>4</sup> This approach became probably even more intensively cultivated by linguistics after Darwinism had made its full impact in this field as well; as stated by Harris and Taylor: “The greatest influence on linguistic in the nineteenth century was exercised not by a linguist but by a biologist: Charles Darwin” (Harris & Taylor, p.186). If not directly then at least indirectly Darwin influenced language studies through their common use of the tree-trope (see e.g. the essay “Darwin and the Growth of Language Theory” in Beer, pp.95-114 and Alter 1999), and he heavily influenced A. Schleicher’s approach which turned language studies into a positivistic science he denominated *Linguistik*. This strand of positivism and evolutionism was continued well into the 20<sup>th</sup> C., and J. Errington has analysed how the prominent linguist O. Jespersen’s analysis focussed on “lines of development” and how “he drew on languages of “barbarous races” which are rich in words for particulars, but not for broader categories which sumsume them”; that is, “primitiveness was [seen as] evident in languages which prevented speakers from seeing the abstract woods for the concrete trees.” (Errington 2008, pp.129-132; quotes from p.131)

illustrious taxonomic skills resembled the bright principles of their enlightened modes of governance. And whenever the empirical data proved to be of a too convoluted character to fit into this straight scheme, the site where this state of uncivilized affairs was reputed to loom ungoverned was merely removed to a remoter, less known region which thus became ripe for conceptual colonization and territorial expansion. Such discursive strategies worked, however, only when referring to rather unknown languages, spoken in relatively uncharted realms, and where the native's own voices or scribbles did not interfere too loudly with these discourses.

Despite frequent recourses to- and quotes from Adam Smith's economic theories, Crawford seemed not to have mentioned Smith's work on language before a short reference to it in the entry on 'Language' in the "Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands & Adjacent Countries" from 1856.<sup>1</sup> There were thus no references in neither HIA nor in the "Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language". Although it would be rather remarkable if Crawford had not been at least aware of the main tenets in Smith's theories of language – given his attendance at Edinburgh University, his general interest in linguistic matters and conjectural history, and in particular the many similarities between his own linguistic studies and Smith's – it cannot be excluded altogether that his explicit inclusion of Smith in his later discourses on linguistic matters was actually prompted by the reference to Smith's theories in the review of the "Grammar and Dictionary" written by his brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Erskine Perry,<sup>2</sup> in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1853.<sup>3</sup> Here Perry drew the attention to aspects of Crawford's analysis where "the theory will inevitably remind the reader of the interesting essay of Adam Smith on the formation of language."<sup>4</sup>

#### 1.3.4 Assessments.

The philosophical aspects and theoretical ideas behind Crawford's approaches to the study of language were, for a large part, products of thoughts and contexts belonging to the 18<sup>th</sup> C.; on the theoretical level he never really embraced the teachings of the 'New Philology', and up to the end he was staunchly critical of the manner in which it converted a secularized version of the genealogical trope into the authoritative referential framework, even though he was well acquainted with, and even adopted, some of methodologies associated with it. From the viewpoint of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1856, p.212. he was here referring to Adam Smith's "beautiful Essay on Language".

<sup>2</sup> Crawford's 2<sup>nd</sup> wife (they married in 1820) was "the beautiful Miss Horatia Perry, daughter of Mr. James Perry" (Murchison 1868, p.clii) – and thus the sister of Sir Thomas Erskine Perry. Erskine Perry acknowledged openly this relationship by starting the review with referring to "my relative, Mr. John Crawford". The acquaintance between the two dated to at least as early as the 1830s when they both pertained to the "Radical Club" in London (List quoted in Rowe, p.120). Furthermore, Crawford in 1853 reviewed two of Erskine Perry's recently published books on Indian languages and the British colonial rule in India in the Edinburgh Review. (Crawford 1853a)

<sup>3</sup> Perry (1806-1882) was a liberal judge at the supreme court of Bombay from 1840 until his retirement in 1852, and simultaneously he served as president of the Indian board of education. (ODNB, Barker & Prior)

<sup>4</sup> Perry, p.259.

Continental, comparative philology, then, the anonymous author of his obituary in the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië* was quite right in deeming his work somewhat obsolete by the standards of the 1860s.<sup>1</sup> The leading Dutch scholar in Malay, H.N. van der Tuuk,<sup>2</sup> had similarly accused Crawfurd of not taking into account the newer Continental research done in this field before the publication of his Malay grammar and dictionary.<sup>3</sup> Van der Tuuk's criticism was not just targeted towards Crawfurd, though; rather it pointed to the general state of affairs in British studies on language and its affiliated fields. Van der Tuuk thus had to acknowledge that Crawfurd's Malay grammar and dictionary, despite its flaws, was "considered in England as the standard dictionary";<sup>4</sup> this, however, epitomized the poor condition of philology on the British Isles when measured by the yardstick of Continental comparative philology. Even the two major scions of this discipline in Britain, J.C. Prichard and H. Latham,<sup>5</sup> were in the end more ethnologists than philologists; this influenced their approaches and pick of topics. Within this social- and intellectual environment, Crawfurd's theories and hypotheses maintained their relevance right up to the end of his life,<sup>6</sup> and in the most controversial debates – either involving matters on language or deriving crucial evidence from linguistic studies – his voice continued to be both heard and heeded by friend as well as foe.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Trouwens de taalkundige geschriften van Crawfurd missen overall het echt wetenschappelijk karakter, en toonen dat hij als linguïst niet op de hoogte van zijn tijd stond." (*Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, Derde Serie 2de Jaargang, Tweede Deel, p.161, 1868)

<sup>2</sup> For more on his work as a Malay scholar, see especially *Grijns*, and *Errington 2008*, p.97 & pp.139-142.

<sup>3</sup> *Tuuk 1865a*, pp.181-182; van der Tuuk here intimated that Crawfurd "who seems not to understand Dutch, has taken no account of what Dutch Scholars have written on the subject since Marsden's time." This was followed by a simile illustrating the, according to van der Tuuk, unscholarly approach: "What would an Englishman say of a Dutch work on Ceylon the writer of which was unacquainted with English?"

<sup>4</sup> *Tuuk 1865a*, p.182.

<sup>5</sup> As stressed by Aarsleff (*Aarsleff 1966/1983*, p.208. For more on their ethnological work, see *Augstein 1999*, *Henze*, and *Stocking 1973* (on Prichard), and *Qureshi* (on Latham), as well as *Stocking 1987*, esp. pp.48 -62 & 102-109.

<sup>6</sup> And in the immediate aftermath as well, as the following few examples will illustrate. Apart from quoting Crawfurd as a still viable authority on the Indian Archipelago, its races, history, customs, and languages, H. Yule, the eminent exponent of a new generation of colonial scholar-administrators (see e.g. *Bingle*), was thus still in 1880 referring to him as "the late venerable John Crawfurd" (p.291), the HIA was labelled a "great work" (p.296), and together with W. von Humboldt they were characterised as "eminent and truth-loving men" despite their biased approaches (p.300) (all quotes from *Yule 1880*). The same year A.H. Keane emphasised Crawfurd alongside Wallace and W. von Humboldt as the most prominent theorists on the "Inter-Oceanic Races and languages", and he furthermore emphasised how Crawfurd's theory was "learned argued" (both on p.255), despite some "weak points" (p.257); and this was despite the fact that the author himself later professed his allegiance to a genealogical explanation rather than to Crawfurd's theories (p.280) (see *Keane* for all these references). Likewise, the scholar-administrator and Honorary Librarian of the Royal Asiatic Society, R.N. Cust, stressed in 1878 how "Crawfurd put the local experience of forty years and a knowledge of the vernaculars to bear against the theories of Humboldt and Bopp" – theoretical discrepancies revealing a "controversy, involving the deepest questions of the sciences of ethnology, languages, and geology." (*Cust*, p.13. For more on Cust's linguistic studies and their colonial context, see *Irvine*)

<sup>7</sup> As noted, for instance, in *Beer*, pp.82-83 & *Ellingson*, chs.13-19.



## 2. Methodological Approaches and Produced Evidence.

### 2.1 The ‘Word List’ and the Establishment of Genealogical Affinity.

When Marsden aired his remarkable and, in all senses of the word, extensive hypothesis on the existence of an essential affinity between the languages spoken by the societies inhabiting the vast zone from “Madagascar eastwards to the Marquesas, or nearly from the east coast of Africa to the west coast of America”, the linguistic evidence he afforded in support hereof was the alleged “*manifest connexion* in many of the words by which the inhabitants of the islands express their *simple ideas*, and between some of the most distant, a striking affinity.”<sup>1</sup> In order to appreciate the argumentative potential of this assertion in its original context, three aspects in particular beg further explanation: 1) what was meant by a *manifest connexion*, and how could this be identified; 2) which ideas could be considered *simple*, and what did this entail in terms of larger meaning-attributive frameworks; 3) how come that this manifest connexion between words expressing simple ideas was perceived as an indication of-, or perhaps even constituting a sufficient condition for, the existence of a *genealogical affinity between both the analysed languages and the inhabitants* of the societies who spoke these.

In 1780, when this article was written, there existed no codified and generally agreed criteria upon which a *manifest connexion* could be identified. Almost 40 years would elapse before R. Rask and J. Grimm would launch their ideas on how the demonstration of regularities in sounds shifts would constitute the most ample evidence in support of genealogical affinity (and then they only showed this to be valid within the Indo-European languages); the methodological anarchy associated with the wild etymologies continued to reign relatively unbridled.<sup>2</sup> The constitutive criteria defining such a *manifest connexion*, as well as the methods applied to recognize it, thus depended on the schemes devised by each individual scholar or traveller. The only commonly shared guiding principle seemed to be the notion that the *manifest connexion* had to be found in the expression plane of the languages (i.e. in the sounds), whenever there existed an assumed similarity on the content plane qua the *simple ideas* referred to above. Heuristically, these connexions were primarily sought after within the scope of single words, despite the 18<sup>th</sup> C. debates on the possibility of expressing the same idea in radically different ways as discussed in the previous chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden 1782, p.155; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> As stressed by Davies, before Rask and Grimm there existed no consensus regarding “what degree of formal and semantic similarity was required to conclude that two words were cognate” (Davies, p.48); for more on this problem in the context of the construction and interpretation of a language of images, see Eco 1995, pp.170-171.

In the case of exotic languages, like those studied by Marsden, another problem invariably arose: there was no regularity in the manners in which the travellers and compilers of these languages transcribed the sounds they had heard into written words that later could be compared and adduced as evidence in support of their hypotheses. The same problem arose when discussing the principles regarding the transliteration of the characters in one written language to those of the Roman alphabet. In other words, there existed no standardized orthography, and hence the same word, in the same language, could be written in various ways by different travellers; and conversely, marked differences in the pronunciation (and accompanying meaning) of these words may unconsciously have been blurred and made to appear identical when transcribed. The Quaker physician, philanthropist, and intimate friend of Prichard, T. Hodgkin (1798-1866)<sup>1</sup> noted on this topic in 1827 that “no two things generally can be more unlike than the words of unknown languages, as reported by two voyagers or travellers of different nations.”<sup>2</sup> At best this rendered the work of comparing such a material a tedious task and at worst an insurmountable one. When reviewing A. Balbi’s endeavours of undertaking such a global comparison including all the known languages, a dismayed T. Hodgkin mused: “the more we reflect on the subject, the stronger is our conviction that all attempts to classify such scanty, imperfect, and erroneous materials, or make them the basis on which to establish an affinity or consanguinity between nations is a *mere waste of time*.”<sup>3</sup>

Meanwhile, in 1788, Sir William Jones had endeavoured to devise a standardised mode of transliterating Sanskrit texts into the letters of the Roman alphabet, an enterprise which in the long run culminated “in the International Phonetic Alphabet, which represents *sounds* directly rather than *Scripts*.”<sup>4</sup> For the period concerned here, however, this did not result in any codified consensus.<sup>5</sup> Not because the philologists were unaware of the problems, though. Both Marsden and Crawford published articles on this problem, presenting their own solutions of how to render the Roman alphabet applicable to all oriental languages;<sup>6</sup> or in Crawford’s case the more limited project of representing Malayan sounds with Roman letters.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, the producing of an orthography

---

<sup>1</sup> On Hodgkin, his philanthropic and philological work, as well as his relation to Prichard, see *Stocking 1973* and the entry on Hodgkin in ODNB. (*Kass*)

<sup>2</sup> *Hodgkin 1827*, p.389.

<sup>3</sup> *Hodgkin 1827*, p.390; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> *Trautmann 2006*, p.72.

<sup>5</sup> And for a much longer period in other colonial spheres as well. For instance in Africa – Errington has thus analysed how dialectal differences within the Shona language (spoken in present day Zimbabwe) became transformed into different languages mainly through the application of various orthographies by the different missionary groups from different European countries who studied and taught these languages; through the teachings of these missionaries and other modes colonial governance, this perception of different languages became reified in time, and as such it created and served to underpin notions of ethnic differences. (*Errington 2008*, pp.113-116)

<sup>6</sup> Marsden thus published an article entitled “On A Conventional Roman Alphabet Applicable to Oriental Languages” in his “Miscellaneous Works” (1834).

<sup>7</sup> I here refer to the short article “A Scheme for Representing Malayan Sounds by Roman Letters” published in JIA, Vol.II (1848), pp.564-570. (*Crawford 1848b*)



for each of the studied languages in the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific composed an integrated part of the linguistic analysis contained in the “Preliminary Dissertation” to Crawford’s “Malay Grammar and Dictionary”.<sup>1</sup> Yet, when C.H. van der Tuuk reviewed the existing dictionaries of the Malay language in 1865, his main objection against Crawford’s Dictionary was precisely its alleged lack of orthographic consistency.<sup>2</sup> This is not the place to dwell too much on the finer details of transcription and transliteration, but I just want to emphasize its implications within the larger theoretical framework: as partly a result-, partly a cause of the lack of methodological consensus, this aspect contributed to the interpretive freedom with which linguistic data could be derived and classified, and later adduced as evidence in support of widely divergent hypotheses regarding the origin and dissemination of the analysed languages, as well as regarding the affiliated questions concerning the interrelation between language on the one hand and race, nation, and civilization on the other.

The lists of words which Marsden presented as evidence in support of his hypothesis were indicative of what he considered to be the *simple ideas* expressed through these. The lists consisted of a number of words expressing the same ideas or objects in the various analysed languages, or at least in the languages for which such data were procurable. Although Marsden never explicitly stated the criteria upon which these words were selected, it is possible to relate most of these to a limited number of categories: beginning with the numerals, Marsden then proceeded with the basic terms expressing kinship relations, with those designating the parts of the body, garments, day-night, black-white, (to) die, fire, water, earth, people, an enumeration of the basic foodstuffs in the region, the heavenly bodies; and then concluding with the words for I, yes, come hither, and God.<sup>3</sup> With few exceptions he repeated this list of words in the copious “Comparative vocabulary” in his “On the Polynesian, or East-Insular Languages” from 1834.<sup>4</sup> The biggest difference between the two lists, the latter published more than 50 years after the former, was the number of languages included in the lists. Whereas the list published in 1782 contained 12 languages spoken in the region, apart from Chinese and English,<sup>5</sup> this had by 1834 soared to somewhere around 90 languages, and for several of these the vocabulary included either several dialects or discrepant

---

<sup>1</sup> Whenever the available source-material allowed it, Crawford thus began his analysis of the language with an attempt to present an orthography on its phonetic characteristics, before analysing its lexicography and grammatical structures.

<sup>2</sup> *Tuuk 1865a*, p.182. for a discussion of this aspect of Tuuk’s project, see also *Grijns*, pp.361-362.

<sup>3</sup> Table facing p.154 in *Marsden 1782a*. Apart from these the words for ‘teeth’ did also appear in the list, inserted in between the terms designating the basic foodstuffs.

<sup>4</sup> Among the most conspicuous changes was the insertion of the term ‘man’ and the substitution of ‘die’ with dead, whereas terms like I, yes, come hither, God had been omitted along with some of the specific terms belonging to some of the classes mentioned above.

<sup>5</sup> Of these 12 languages, 5 were only spoken on Sumatra; the reminder, including Malay, were composed of languages spoken in the zone between Madagascar and Tahiti.

source-material – so, in all it amounted to 140 more or less complete lists! Apart from what Marsden classified as the “Polynesian, or East-Insular languages”, the vocabulary contained: specimens of languages spoken on the Indo-Chinese part of the Asian mainland; Australian, African and South American languages; and languages belonging to the so-called Negro nations both within Hither Polynesia (the Indian Archipelago) and in the region between this and Further Polynesia. The biggest difference was thus to be found in the amount of available source-material and the data that this provided; especially in the case of Further Polynesia had this had expanded vastly after the arrival of the missionaries to this area during the early decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> C.. Another reason for the expansion in the number of included languages was the extended geographical scope; this was particularly cogent in the material on the regions nowadays known as New Guinea and Melanesia that had become available in the meantime.

The most remarkable feature, however, was not as much the changes between the two lists as the similarities: in all fundamental aspects they were identical, indicating continuity in terms of approach and applied methodology. This was all the more remarkable given the rapid development which philological methods had undergone in the meantime. Yet, what it does demonstrate is that this comparison of words was the product of deliberate and consistent methodological reflections, resting on a set of epistemological preconditions. As emphasized by T.R. Trautmann: “The comparative vocabulary is not a neutral enterprise but an abstraction from living languages that freezes and organizes certain aspects of them for a certain purpose.”<sup>1</sup> As such it rested on what Trautmann has dubbed the methodology of the *Word List*; this was “comprised of what are conceived to be the simplest, most primitive and necessary conceptions that languages must name at their very creation – words which constitute, for that reason, the native core of those languages.”<sup>2</sup> The *simple ideas* Marsden mentioned did thus not refer (directly) to simple ideas in the Lockean sense; instead it implied a notion of simplicity associated with the simplest aspects of human thought and interaction in a historicised context of primitive beginnings.

The so-called *simple ideas* represented by all these words in the analysed languages were thus defined as simple in the sense of being attributed a pristine quality; they expressed ideas that would necessarily have been in existence from the dawn of time, or at least from the earliest stages of society. Hence these simple ideas could be associated with the notion a shared origin, if the expressions for these, i.e. the *words*, exhibited sufficient similarity. Normally these, assumedly arbitrary, words, expressing the simple ideas, would only exhibit similar forms, if they were

---

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann 2006, p.22.

<sup>2</sup> Trautmann 2006, p.25. Hymes’s designation *basic vocabulary* is identical to Trautmann’s *Word List*. (Hymes, pp.65-68 & 78-8).

affiliated with each other.<sup>1</sup> The ideas expressed by these terms represented the lowest common denominator in terms of civilization; that is, ideas without which any kind of societal structure appeared inconceivable. This argument thus presupposed, without ever articulating it, a progressionist and stadial development of society as constituting the norm – *and* with a stadial progression of language being emblematic of this pattern. Otherwise, if language was assumed to have been divinely created in a perfect state, and subsequently had undergone a process of degeneration, then it would not make much sense to attach such an analytical importance to the words expressive of *simple ideas* – indeed, there would hardly be any incentive to classify such ideas as simple in this sense.<sup>2</sup>

Although not stating it explicitly in his discourse on language, Marsden had already embraced the trope of stadial progress of civilization as an essential element, as it was clearly demonstrated in his “History of Sumatra”.

Another premise inherent in this argument was an assumption indicating that once words representing these ideas had been created, then these would most likely proceed to exist, even when the language became mixed with elements from other languages or language families. That is, a particular propensity towards permanency was vested in these words articulating simple ideas. Words borrowed from other languages would rather express the introduction of new, more refined, ideas, or subsidiary they would normally only substitute or be synonymous with words of an autochthonous origin that represented such more refined ideas.

This facilitated conjectures within two fields: first, all those *peoples* or *nations* who possessed a shared stock of words expressing the simple ideas must have had a common origin,<sup>3</sup> since it was not likely that they had borrowed these words from other *sources*.<sup>4</sup> Second, it facilitated a reconstruction of the routes and of the relative chronology of the dissemination of *civilization* in the various areas through a tracing of the linguistic connexions of the terms expressing the ideas,

---

<sup>1</sup> As stressed by Trautmann: “The critical aspect of the proof is that the vocabulary is made up of words that are radical, that is, root words *native to each language*.” (Trautmann 2006, p.27; my italics)

<sup>2</sup> See Trautmann 2006, p.27 for an elaboration of these issues.

<sup>3</sup> Trautmann emphasised how the “method of the word list constitutes in its seeming simplicity the first surgical move of historical linguistics: the cutting away of the later, borrowed, and complex accretions to reveal the *native core of language*, so that the operation of comparison can be performed on the *authentic body of language*. This allows the historical relations among languages to *be figured as the radiating branches of a tree*, since the borrowings or mixtures that would make the branches grow into one another have been discarded by analysis. *It is well to keep in mind the conception of language that undergirds the genealogies of languages in historical linguistics*.” (Trautmann 2006, p.34; my italics)

<sup>4</sup> This word is in itself a metaphor indicative of a prefiguring genealogical model: an idea that shared features must primarily be explained in terms of a shared origin. This was a trait which the study of language shared with textual philology; it was exactly this tendency to explain shared features in terms of an assumed shared stemma and the subsequent tracing/(re)construction of the often missing original text that comparative philology appropriated from textual philology during the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., and which became formalized with the approaches propagated by A. Schleicher (Benes 2008, pp.228-235; Alter 1999, pp.73-79; Davies, pp.165-189; see also Irwin 2005, pp.72-82 for a discussion of the intersections between textual and linguistic philology in the context of the study of Arabian languages and literature in European intellectual history)

technological objects, or structural features associated with the various stratified levels of civilization. It was upon this rationale that Marsden judged that the Sanskrit influence in Malay was not original but a result of later influence, as sketched in the previous Part. And it was upon this principle that Crawford developed his elaborate linguistic palaeontology as it will be discussed in the next chapter.<sup>1</sup> In short, this argumentative mode was commonly accepted and consistently applied by all those who wrote on the ethnology and early history of the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia during this period, and who derived most of their evidence from language.

Thence, upon this set of premises and assumptions, it could be inferred that there would be a genealogical affinity between the analysed languages, if, and only if, it could be shown that a *manifest connexion* existed between the *radical* words expressing these *simple ideas*.

In choosing this mode of procedure Marsden inscribed himself into well established tradition. The use of a lexical comparison to prove a genealogical connexion between two or more languages had been in use since at least the 17<sup>th</sup> C.,<sup>2</sup> but, as stressed by Aarsleff, it was Leibniz who treated this topic most thoroughly.<sup>3</sup> Leibniz was acutely aware of the epistemological pitfalls and methodological vagaries associated with this approach, yet he insisted that “the harmony of languages is the best means of determining the origin of nations, and virtually the only one that is left to us where historical accounts fail”.<sup>4</sup> As a result Leibniz argued against lexical comparisons that transcended time and space,<sup>5</sup> and at the same time he endeavoured to systematise the approach and turn it into something that resembled a methodology; stressing the importance of a consistent approach to be applied by the many travellers and (often rather unskilled) compilers of languages, Leibniz encouraged a collection of “the Lord’s Payer in as many languages and dialects as at all possible”, or, alternatively, of “the basic words of the vocabulary” – these “basic words” referring to roughly the same notions as those constituting the methodological core in Marsden’s later linguistic analyses.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Mallory, pp.28-29. Mallory placed Crawford’s as one of A. Pictet’s precursors in the development of this approach which Pictet carried even further and baptized *linguistic palaeontology* in 1859 in his book on the “Origin of the Indo-Europeans” (see also Blench, p.55 and Olender, pp.93-105). Stocking also associated Max Müller with the techniques of linguistic palaeontology even before the term was coined (Stocking 1987, p.59)

<sup>2</sup> See Davies, pp.47-48; she here emphasised the part played by Grotius and J. de Laet in devising and applying such schemes. See also Hymes, pp.65-68.

<sup>3</sup> On the aspects of the reception and impact of Leibniz’s ideas, Aarsleff wrote: “Unfortunately his direct influence remained somewhat less than it might have been, and a number of etymological principles were later to be established independently, as it seems, of Leibniz. But he exercised a lasting and very important indirect influence through his encouragement to etymological study and the collection of material, of early texts, of dialects, of placenames, plantnames, family names, and other kinds of terms.” (Aarsleff 1982, p.94)

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in Aarsleff 1982, p.85.

<sup>5</sup> Aarsleff 1982, pp.92-94.

Indeed, T.R. Trautmann has intimated that the short text Leibniz published on etymology in 1718 “is of critical importance and may well be the model for subsequent lists, including Marsden’s.”<sup>1</sup> Whatever his source of inspiration may have been, Marsden was certainly not alone in pursuing this approach; the latter half of the 18<sup>th</sup> C. and the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. saw a wide array of comparisons of non-European languages based on the same tenets as those resting behind Leibniz’s and Marsden’s word lists. Some resulted from officially endowed, or at least state encouraged, large-scale projects like the one associated with the British governance in India,<sup>2</sup> like the one carried out within the Russian Empire under the auspices of Pallas,<sup>3</sup> or the one on American Indian languages inaugurated by T. Jefferson and later continued by in particular S. Du Ponceau.<sup>4</sup> Others were conducted by individuals working alone who scavenged all available material in the shape of historical writings, earlier linguistic treatises, travelogues, correspondence, etc. for vocabularies that might furnish them with the data necessary for such comparisons;<sup>5</sup> among the more influential were the multi-volume publications with a universal scope by the Spanish Jesuit L. Hervás y Panduro in the late 18<sup>th</sup> C.,<sup>6</sup> the “Mithradates” initiated by J.C. Adelung and after his demise completed by J.S. Vater (1806-1817),<sup>7</sup> and the one compiled by A. Balbi. A.M. Davies thus stressed how Balbi in his “L’Atlas Ethnographique du Globe” (1826) furnished “word lists for some 700 languages, [and] selected 26 *terms* which again included words for some natural elements, some kinship terms, the parts of the body and the numerals and argued that these were *sufficient to locate each language into the family to which it belonged.*”<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann 2006, p.31.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Trautmann 1997/2004 and Cohn 1996, pp.16-56 for two informed and highly influential analyses of the entwined relation between language study and colonial exigencies; the two differ somewhat regarding the interpretation of the importance attributed to the two elements of *scholarly interest* vs. *governmental instrumentality*. Trautmann was prone to emphasize that the importance of the former should be reappraised, whereas Cohn mainly focused on the latter aspect. For an analysis of the regional differences between these aspects in ‘Calcutta School of Orientalism’ and the ‘Madras School of Orientalism’, see the Introduction in Trautmann 2009b.

<sup>3</sup> See Davies, pp.37-38.

<sup>4</sup> See Trautmann 2009a, pp.93-94 (the article “Hullabaloo about Telugu”, org. published in 1999). For more on Ponceau’s linguistic and ethnological writings, see e.g. Pratt 1971, Smith 1983, and Swiggers.

<sup>5</sup> In a letter dated 31st January, 1789, Marsden thus described how I am making a catalogue of all dictionaries, grammars, and vocabularies that have ever been published, with the exception of the modern cultivated European, and the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. ... The most troublesome, but not the least necessary, part of the task is, that of *hunting out vocabularies in books of voyages and travels*, where they are in great degree buried, as there exist no reference to them”. (Letter quoted in Marsden 1838, p.71; my italics)

<sup>6</sup> See Davies, pp.38-40, and for a more thorough description *Yanguas*. Hervás’s work was not well known in Britain, as stated by T. Young in his review of Adelung’s “Mithridates” in the Quarterly Review; Young stated that the importance of Hervás’s seemed to have been “more in the preliminary and mechanical labour of accumulation, than in the ulterior and more intellectual departments of comparison and arrangement”. (Young, p.251). Yet by c. 1830 both Hodgkin and Marsden mentioned him alongside the other great compilers of linguistic material who also endeavoured to classify the languages on a global scope. (See Hodgkin 1827, p.379 and Marsden 1838, pp.152-153)

<sup>7</sup> See Davies, pp.40-41.

<sup>8</sup> Davies, p.47 (my italics); see also pp.42-43. Although generally favourable, T. Hodgkin’s review of this work in the Foreign Quarterly Review contained some reservations towards the choice of these 26 words in the analytical vocabulary which “appears much too scanty to enable us to form a correct judgement of any language” (Hodgkin, 1827, p.384), and he expressed the wish for having the word list “accompanied by short specimens of different languages” –

A mere perusal of the published catalogues on the books on linguistic topics in Marsden's library<sup>1</sup> will suffice to prove that Marsden's own linguistic interests were of a global scope as well, even though he did not publish any works of this kind.<sup>2</sup> Apart from his interest in the languages belonging to what he himself had baptized the *Polynesian* language family, Marsden was also keenly interested in the languages spoken on the African continent; here he was undoubtedly once more spurred by the interests of his former 'patron', Sir Joseph Banks, as J. Gascoigne has pointed out.<sup>3</sup> He thus wrote a "Observations on the Languages of Siwah" included in the "Journal of Frederick Horneman's Travels from Cairo to Mourzouk" from 1802, and extensive parts of a letter from Marsden, containing recommendations on how to study the languages spoken by the inhabitants along the Congo River, was inserted in the published account of the ill-fated Tuckey expedition up that river in 1816;<sup>4</sup> this was the first expedition organized by Marsden's successor as 2<sup>nd</sup> Secretary at the Admiralty, (later Sir) John Barrow.<sup>5</sup>

In his memoirs Marsden claimed to have had such a global project in his mind from the very onset of his studies of the Languages in the South Seas and the Indian Archipelago; yet "whilst I was yearly adding to my collections, and looking forward to additional contributions, many works successively made their appearance that more or less partook of the nature of my plan, and had the effect of anticipating my object. ... Thus the ground that I had marked out for my operations was preoccupied; and although my plan was not entirely superseded, and I might still have flattered myself with the expectation of producing a more extensive comparison, as well as of more practical utility, yet my zeal in the cause was necessarily weakened, and I was induced to direct my thoughts to other studies."<sup>6</sup>

Although not of a universal scope, J. Klaproth's "Asia Polyglotta" (1823) was of a similar kind;<sup>7</sup> it was based almost entirely on a lexical comparison,<sup>8</sup> albeit though the value of this was often considered dubious, as indicated by Crawford's disparaging remark concerning Klaproth's

---

something like the Lord's Prayer". (p.399) Yet the authority of the very method itself, that of the word list, was *not* questioned in this review.

<sup>1</sup> That is, *Marsden 1796* and *Marsden 1827*.

<sup>2</sup> Trautmann mentioned an unpublished manuscript of this kind by Marsden (*Trautmann 2006*, p.23, n.).

<sup>3</sup> *Gascoigne 1994*, p.167-168.

<sup>4</sup> See *Horneman*, pp.189-192, and *Tuckey*, pp.384-395.

<sup>5</sup> On the linguistic researches conducted on this expedition and the questionnaire it brought with it, see *Fleming*, p.22 and see also *Lloyd*, pp.15-21.

<sup>6</sup> *Marsden 1838*, pp.152 & 153.

<sup>7</sup> Published in Paris; a 2<sup>nd</sup>, almost identical, edition was published in 1831. Klaproth had before been engaged in Russian service and as such also participated in the mapping of the languages and people of this vast empire that continued after Pallas's work; he had both travelled extensively in Caucasus and had been a member of the scientific branch of the failed Embassy to China in 1806-1807 (see *Benes 2004* and *Benes 2008*, pp.3-88; during the latter expedition, however, he remained in Irkutsk while the rest of the Embassy proceeded towards Peking [although it never got further than Urga in Mongolia], in order to work in the libraries there and thus gain a deeper knowledge of China through the books available in Irkutsk than he allegedly could have done in China itself! (stated by J. Potocki, in a letter to Count Golovkin, the head of the Embassy; in *Potocki*, p.48-51)

<sup>8</sup> *Benes 2008*, p.84.

inferences with regard to the affinities of the words in the Formosan language: “some of his derivations are obviously fanciful, and others palpably erroneous.”<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding being directed against some of the flaws specific to Klaproth’s text, this remark also touched upon some general characteristics ingrained in this approach that might help to explain both 1) the prolonged use of word list, even after it was rendered obsolete by methodological innovations on the continent and 2) its ultimate abandonment. Its continued use by continental scholars as well as British ditto seem to suggest that it was not a mere instance of methodological isolation that allowed Marsden to rely on its authority alone as late as 1834. Despite all its weaknesses, the word list still possessed at least two undeniable qualities – 1) its simplicity facilitated a potentially much larger comparative scope by focussing on a few, assumedly universally shared linguistic features, and 2) it allowed the inclusion in the analysis of many languages about which the available information was scarce and on which systematic knowledge was absent. This was obviously the case for the languages spoken by people inhabiting the realms of the world that had not yet been profoundly penetrated by the European regimes of knowledge and power.

As J.-M. Degérando stressed in his manual on “The Observation of Savage Peoples”, “the first words that they [the explorers] will aim to know will be the words for the objects that are both the simplest and the most palpable, like the various parts of the body, and the material substances that the savage can see.”<sup>2</sup> Or, in other words, many of the notions expressed by the terms included in the word list did not solely express simple ideas, but they were also the simplest terms for the first travellers to acquire with something resembling certainty; they thus represented the first fragile steps towards establishing a communication when the travellers first met- and interacted with the natives in the *contact zone*.<sup>3</sup> However, as interest(s) in these zones and their inhabitants grew, a more thorough knowledge of their languages became imminent; as an answer to this necessity a deeper knowledge of those languages was gained through studies conducted mainly by missionaries, together with that of the scholar-administrators in the colonized regions, and always in collaboration with their ‘native’ informants and/or knowledge producers.<sup>4</sup> These studies in time

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawford 1852a*, p.cxxxiii. For more on Klaproth’s (correct) theories regarding the languages of Formosa and their affiliation to the languages spoken in the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific, see *van Driem*, pp.238-239 and *Klöter*, pp.214-216. According to G. van Driem, Klaproth appeared to have been the first “to state clearly that the Formosan languages were members of the Austronesian family, genetically related to Malay and Malagasy.” (p.239) Today, there is a general consensus on Taiwan (Formosa) being the seat of origin of the *Austronesian* language family, of which the *Malayo-Polynesian* composes the by far widest distributed subgroup (the ‘Bellwood-Blust synthesis’, *Andaya 2008*, pp.19-21. See also *Tryon, Pawley & Ross*, and *Pawley*, pp.95-112).

<sup>2</sup> *Degérando*, p.73. Obviously, written as a manual, this assertion was rather a normative than descriptive; and furthermore it was articulated from the staunchly materialist view point of the *Ideologues*. However, in this case it appeared to comply rather well with the actual experiences of most travellers.

<sup>3</sup> For a very informed analysis and discussion of this topic in a Pacific context, see *Douglas 2003*.

<sup>4</sup> See also *Trautmann 2006*, p.35 6 p.41.

facilitated a substitution of the methodology of the word list with the more sophisticated and systemised approaches grounded in comparative grammar and in phonetic analysis too.<sup>1</sup>

## **2.2 Genealogy Adduced from Other Sources: J.D. Lang's Argumentation**

Rather than merely relying on the authority vested in the word list J.D. Lang amassed a vast array of 'evidence', composed from data collected within widely diverging fields, and where the aspect of language only constituted a limited part of the whole argument. However, just like in the case of the word list, all of this was firmly inscribed into the genealogical framework and furthermore curbed within the narrow confines of a strict Biblical chronology.<sup>2</sup> In support of his hypothesis on the genealogical affiliation between the peoples inhabiting Polynesia, the Indian Archipelago, and the Asian mainland, Lang thus adduced evidence derived from allegedly shared features in the social organization (prevalent system of 'caste'); common cultural traits (the notion of 'taboo', the practice of circumcision, and other particular customs indicating "similar modes of thinking, and corresponding peculiarities of action") as well as aspects of material culture (production of clothes and betel chewing); resemblances in the appearance of their religious images; their own oral traditions; and similarities in "their physical conformation and in their general character".<sup>3</sup>

To these he added linguistic evidence, both in direct and in derived form. In the former case, Lang referred to both Horne Tooke and Dr. Johnson, before turning to the particular context and positing himself with Marsden and Raffles and arguing against Leyden and Crawford.<sup>4</sup> Lang, however, only referred to- used the two former in a function of theoretical authorities, as notabilities who sanctioned the applicability of linguistic evidence in the tracing of "the genealogy of mankind" and in locating national origins.<sup>5</sup> Just like Tooke, Lang also ascribed a pivotal role to the *particles*, as providers of irrefutable evidence in support of the hypothesis that "both the nations and the languages of China and Polynesia have sprung from the same ancient and prolific source", given that, according to Lang's rather sweeping analysis, "these particles are in many instances not merely

---

<sup>1</sup> Yet this method still continue to constitute an integrated, and often decisive, part of the linguistic evidence adduced when prehistoric routes of migration of peoples and cultures are discerned; see e.g. A Pawley's presentation of the recent research in the tracing of prehistoric routes of migration and spread of language in Oceania. Here one of the core elements of the linguistic evidence continues to consist of identifying "regular sound correspondences in words for very basic concepts like 'eye', 'head', 'nose', 'two', 'three', 'father', 'mother', 'stone', 'water', 'sun', 'moon', 'fire', 'tree', 'bird', 'louse', 'eat', 'sleep', and 'die'." (Pawley, pp.88-89) Or, in other words, an almost verbatim repetition of the original word list conceived 300 years ago by Leibniz!

<sup>2</sup> The genealogical framework did not, as already seen, necessarily predicate an avowal of the chronology delineated by the Scriptures. Indeed, unlike his contemporary, Newton, who dedicated much effort to construing a chronology in concordance with the biblical one (see MacGrane, pp.57-61), there is, as stressed by Aarsleff, no indication of Leibniz ever accepting the shallow time frame of the Scriptures. (Aarsleff 1982, p.89)

<sup>3</sup> Lang 1834, pp.5-18.

<sup>4</sup> Lang 1834, p.20 & pp.30-35; Lang, however, harboured some reservations against some of the finer details in Marsden's hypothesis, but in terms of the general interpretation of linguistic evidence they concurred.

<sup>5</sup> Lang 1834, p.19.



similar, but absolutely identical”, and “such coincidences cannot possibly be accidental: *they are far less equivocal than coincidences in the meaning of particular words*”.<sup>1</sup>

Here we have another instance of the eclectic selectivity in the choice of methodology used to uphold one’s theories. Despite his avowed resistance to any form of stadial theory of civilization – usually associated with the Radicals to whom Tooke pertained – Lang still appropriated parts of the methodology instigated by Tooke and later used by Crawford; he used it, however, to prove the exactly opposite point to that championed by Crawford. In this case the discrepancies between the two conflicting interpretations were not grounded in the theoretical or the epistemological aspects of the argument; instead it can be traced to a ‘simple’ disagreement regarding the ascribed *similarity or difference* of the analysed particles. That is, on the level of the existence of a *manifest connexion* on the expression-plane of these particles. Where Crawford identified absolute difference amongst most of these, even within the Indian Archipelago itself, and thence inferred the existence of a multitude of different, genealogically unaffiliated languages there, Lang, on the other hand, saw a sweeping identity in the particles – indicating the shared genealogical affinity of all languages stretching from the Asian mainland to Polynesia (and to the Americas as well).

Yet Lang vested even more argumentative emphasis on what he denominated similar *habitudes of thinking*, and the evidence of this he derived indirectly from a study of language patterns. As a result, all the societies who shared these similar *habitudes of thinking* had, according to Lang, “a language of ceremony or deference distinct from the language of common life a peculiarity which, however repugnant to that innate freedom of thought and of action which forms the noblest inheritance of the western nations, whether of Pelasgic, of Celtic, or of Teutonic origin, is nevertheless in perfect accordance with the general *habitudes* of those races of men, among whom, as in Tartary, a living man is actually worshipped as a God”.<sup>2</sup> Lang stated that this “doubtless affords *a strong presumptive evidence* of an ancient affinity between the Polynesian and the Chinese, or Indo-Chinese, nations.”<sup>3</sup>

All these aspects of alleged similarity – whether societal, cultural, or linguistic – were, within the interpretive space carved out by Lang, a priori perceived as necessarily being the result of sharing the same source of origin. Hence – and without further discussion of the theoretical alternatives like, for instance, that of an independent stadial socio-evolution – such similarities, however far fetched they may appear to us, were firmly inscribed into a genealogical framework and ascribed a methodological value as decisive evidence in support of his hypothesis of an original migration from west to east, ending with the population of the Americas via Polynesia. Viewed separately

---

<sup>1</sup> Lang 1834, pp.40-48; the quotes are from p.42, 44, & 48; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Lang 1834, pp.36-39; the quote is from p.36.

<sup>3</sup> Lang 1834, p.39. My italics.

each type of evidence was perhaps only circumstantial, but in conjunction they seemingly allowed Lang to discern an unmistakable pattern.

### **2.3 Crawford's Critique of the Word List.**

Even though Crawford from the very onset had preferred to explain even the earliest dissemination of languages in terms of the growth of civilization and its diffusion through travel, trade, conquest, and/or colonization – rather than through the genealogical trope with its ingrained assumptions of migrations of peoples together with their languages – the linguistic data contained in his first works were nevertheless presented in the form of vocabularies closely resembling those produced by e.g. Marsden. The short vocabularies inserted in the article on “The History and Languages of the Indian Islands” (1814)<sup>1</sup> as well as the more copious ones in HIA<sup>2</sup> thus included, among many others, all of those terms usually associated with the method of the ‘word list’ – however with the important exception of the numerals.<sup>3</sup> Yet Crawford did never ascribe the terms pertaining to the word list a methodologically privileged position in the same way as Marsden had done; he did not intimate that similarity between these terms should be adduced as evidence in support of genealogical affinity between the languages. His linguistic agenda was simply a different one – viz. that of delineating the progress of civilization and tracing its routes and periods of dissemination.

By 1834, however, silence on these matters had been substituted by a confident contestation. After analyzing the main tenets of Marsden's theories and his main hypothesis, Crawford proceeded with a scathing critique of Marsden's mode inference rather than of his analysis per se: Crawford here stated that “with unfeigned respect for Mr. Marsden's acquirements, experience, and sound judgment, we are disposed to *consider this theory untenable*.”<sup>4</sup> The reason for this was that “Mr. Marsden's principal argument is derived from the identity of *particular words*”, and “agreeing, as we do entirely in *the correctness of his analysis*, and the care, ingenuity, and success with which he has identified words which to a careless observer would appear different, *we disagree with him in the conclusion which he draws from his too narrow premises*.”<sup>5</sup> These too narrow premises were, according to Crawford, precisely those ingrained in the methodology of the word list. He assailed Marsden's use hereof on three particular points: 1) Marsden's analysis was based on a too narrow

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Crawford 1814b*. The largest of these was the one compiled on the Samâng language of the ‘Negro’ tribes in the interior of Malaya (p.163), and which, as stated in HIA, had been “collected for me by the minister of the Prince of Queda, a man of very superior mind” (HIA, Vol.II, p.124). This later formed the core of the vocabulary on this language presented by Klaproth in an article in *Journal Asiatique* in 1833 (*Klaproth 1833*, pp.241-243).

<sup>2</sup> Listed in HIA, Vol.II, pp.125-192. On the sources that Crawford used to compile these, see HIA, Vol.II, pp.120-124.

<sup>3</sup> Although the numerals from one to five were included in one of the vocabularies on the Javanese languages of the ‘vulgar’ and of the ‘nobles’ in *Crawford 1814b*, p.174.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1834*, p.387; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawford 1834*, p.389; my italics.

empirical material; the 34 different terms which he compared in “about fifty languages”<sup>1</sup> did simply not provide sufficient evidence to sustain Marsden’s conclusions.<sup>2</sup> 2) Nor did Crawford concur in the criteria behind the selection of these 34 words, mostly nouns (expressing *simple ideas*): “Now, our objection to these specimens [i.e. classes of words chosen by Marsden], independent of their being too few, is, that they are not of the class that testify to the common origin of different tongues or dialects.”<sup>3</sup> And this 3) led Crawford to assert that these words, selected on the basis of the methodology of the word list, were in fact “*not radical and essential words*, but such as may be, and actually have been *borrowed by one language from another in every part of the world*.”<sup>4</sup> It was on basis of this latter premise – that the borrowing of words referring to the simple ideas and objects contained in the word list actually constituted a universal pattern – that Crawford construed an ‘alternative word list’ upon which his linguistic palaeontology rested, and which will be discussed in the next chapter. As evidence against these words being *radical* or *essential* Crawford focussed on two important aspects: viz. 1) the idea that the terms designating the numerals told more about the level- and influences of civilization than about the genealogical descent, and 2) that many of the terms contained in the word list were actually *generic terms*, indicative of a rather advanced level of conceptual abstraction rather than representing aspects of society at its most fundamental or primitive stage.

Crawford would reiterate the same points in his critique of Marsden’s in both 1848 and in particular in 1852.<sup>5</sup> Each time he would begin his counter-argument against Marsden’s hypothesis on the existence of a genealogically linked family of *Polynesian* languages stretching from Madagascar to Easter Island with questioning the use of numerals as evidence of this genealogical affinity. As he succinctly wrote in 1848: “It is obvious enough, however, that the numerals, especially in a decimal series of them, like the Malayan, to 1000, are far from being words expressing such a class of ideas [That is, the “words imagined to express a simple and primitive

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford’s number (Crawford 1834, p.389); the number which I have encountered in the vocabulary in Marsden 1834 is significantly higher, as I have discussed earlier in this chapter!

<sup>2</sup> In the 2<sup>nd</sup> volume on philological matters in collected during his voyage on L’Astrolabe, 1826-1829, published in 1834, Dumont d’Urville referred with admiration to Marsden’s text from the same year, but, like Crawford, he too criticised Marsden for limiting his comparisons to include only 24 words plus the first ten numerals, instead of the 115 words belonging to the *basic vocabulary* which d’Urville himself preferred; in the end d’Urville thus found the vocabularies collected during Cook’s 2<sup>nd</sup> expedition more than 50 years earlier of more use than Marsden’s! (Dumont d’Urville 1834, p.264; also discussed in Hymes, pp.81-82)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1834, p.390.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1834, p.390; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> See Crawford 1848a, pp. 358-362, and Crawford 1852a, pp.iv-vi (“It has been imagined by some writers that when the class of words expressing *the first and simplest ideas of mankind* are the same in two languages, such languages may be considered as derived from the same stock”, but Crawford stated that “instead of words expressing simple ideas being excluded, I should, on the whole, owing to the familiar and frequent use of the ideas they express, consider them the most amenable to adoption of any class of words whatsoever. Accordingly, such words will be found, either [1] to have supplanted native terms altogether, or to [2] be used as familiar synonyms along with them.”)

class of ideas”]. On the contrary, they must be the invention of a comparatively advanced period of civilization.”<sup>1</sup> In fact, this approach constituted a consistent and continuous element in Crawford’s discourses throughout the entire period in which he published; this is clearly testified in, for instance, the chapter he dedicated to this topic in HIA from 1820<sup>2</sup> and in the article he published on it in TES in 1863.<sup>3</sup> Rather than supplying evidence of genealogical affinity between the languages sharing the same numerals, such a similarity in the number systems and in the names used to designate the numerals was in Crawford’s framework perceived as a sign of dissemination of a superior civilization to zones inhabited by less progressed societies; especially when corroborated by observations which seemingly confirmed that the identity did not extend to lower numerals, like the ones from 1-4. These, on the contrary, allegedly differed in all the societies, and this was indicative of an autochthonous origin of each of these languages.<sup>4</sup>

Although numerals composed an integrated part of the word list, Marsden had himself from the beginning actually questioned the applicability of these as evidence of genealogical affinity. In the short article published in *Archaeologia* in 1782 where Marsden formulated his hypothesis on the existence of the large family of languages shared by peoples from Madagascar to Easter Island, he finished by remarking that:

“I shall only further observe, that though *the very wide extended correspondence of the words denoting numbers* be a striking circumstance to an investigator of these subjects, *it cannot I doubt be admitted as any presumptive proof of a common origin* of the nations making use of them. ... *Counting*, however simple a business it may appear to us, who are used are used to such powerful combinations of numbers, is *a matter of science*, and has *most probably been adopted as an improvement from one nation to another*. Men may exist long together without finding it absolutely necessary to express these ideas, and in the mean

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1848a, pp.359-360. For similar interpretations, see also Crawford 1834, pp.390-392, and Crawford 1852a, pp.iv-v - “must surely be considered as out of the category of early-invented words, for they [1] imply a very considerable social advancement, and [2] seem to be just the class of words most likely to be adopted by any savages of tolerable natural capacity.”

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.I, pp.252-284. Already here he stated two fundamental premises which continued to form the core of his argument throughout the years. In tracing “the history of the origin of numbers” (both the concept of numbers and the numerals used to designate these) he claimed that: (1) “Each tribe appears *originally* to have possessed a distinct system of numerals, and traces of this may be detected in almost all languages” (p.253); and at the same time (2) “generally speaking, the same numerals may be said to prevail from Madagascar to New Guinea, and the Philippines, and even to the South Sea Islands” (p.254). Clearly, this would imply that to Crawford such identical numerals did *not* constitute evidence of a shared origin and a *genealogical* affinity of these languages.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. Crawford 1863b.

<sup>4</sup> The most thorough analysis of this was presented in Crawford 1863b; but in essentials this did not deviate much from the ideas delineated already in 1820 – it only contained vastly more empirical material and its scope was global.

time the improvement of navigation or a fortuitous occurrence of events may convey to them the lights of their more civilized neighbours.”<sup>1</sup>

In other words, Marsden explicitly rejected the idea that numerals represented *simple ideas*, and hence that resemblance in these testified to a shared origin. Instead, this assertion reflected an approach identical to the one later taken by Crawford and repeatedly used by the latter in his argument against the validity of Marsden’s genealogical hypothesis. Yet Marsden continued to abide by the traditional setup of the word list, and in 1834 he still initiated the comparative vocabularies (that constituted the empirical data adduced as evidence for his genealogical hypothesis) with the terms for the numerals from one to ten.<sup>2</sup> Thus Marsden rendered his argument vulnerable to Crawford’s objection which he seemed to have shared himself at least once. This was in spite of the fact that Marsden earlier in the essay actually had stated that: “In the names of numerals, indeed, (in which the others mostly agree), there is a striking discordance, greater than in any other part of the language”,<sup>3</sup> something which he subsequently demonstrated on several occasions.

Regarding the terms in the word list designating such ideas as, among others, *man*, *bird*, and *fish*, Crawford ascribed these a *generic quality* rather than an essential or radical one; and as such “these are obviously general or abstract terms, and, necessarily, could not have been among the first invented.”<sup>4</sup> Concerning terms referring to “the members and other parts of an animal body, natural objects, such as water, fire, earth, a stone, sun, moon, stars” Crawford concurred with Marsden and acknowledged that they “do really represent the earliest and simplest ideas”. Yet an identity in these names still did not necessarily indicate a genealogical affinity, given that “their wide dissemination is easily accounted for. In fact, they are, for the most part, only *synonyms*, along with native terms,”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden 1782, pp.157-158; my italics. In this assessment Marsden appeared to echo Adam Smith’s notion of the complexity of the concept of pure numbers, detached as they are from what they actually count (“These words [i.e. the numerals], though custom has rendered them familiar to us, express, perhaps, the most subtle [Smith’s own spelling!] and refined abstractions which the mind is capable of forming.” Smith 1767, p.457). As we have already seen, Crawford was to resurrect this idea in the 1860s.

<sup>2</sup> Published in Marsden 1834, pp.87-114.

<sup>3</sup> Marsden 1834, p.9.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.361.

<sup>5</sup> The problem was here to account, and especially to provide evidence, for *which term that allegedly had replaced the other term* – that is, *the problem of a relative dating* of the synonyms. And in this context Crawford did not provide any methodology to determine this, except from a theoretical interpretation which (in this context) a priori presumed that the so-called ‘native terms’ preceded the ones evidently derived from Malay; at best the (indeed very soft) evidence consisted in first proving that the so-called ‘native term’ could not be derived from Malay, or any affiliated form of ‘proto-Malay’ (that is an absolute lack of positive evidence that could be interpreted as hinting at any such linguistic connection), then through an exhaustive analysis of the available source-material proving negatively that these ‘native terms’ could not linguistically be linked to any other *known* language family or group, and hence that they must be deemed autochthonous to the area in question; lastly this was interpreted as invariably indicating its prior presence in the region to the ‘Malay synonym’. This interpretation was then allegedly substantiated by pointing to the apparently

or, at best, words that have, in the lapse of time, displaced the latter, as they themselves been frequently displaced by Sanscrit words.”<sup>1</sup> Again, any the identity of these terms included in the word list did not, according to Crawfurd, demonstrate anything else but an indication of subsequent interaction between the societies speaking these languages, and the accompanying dissemination of civilization through the incorporation of such terms from the language of the, in terms of civilization, superior society into the languages spoken by the peoples belonging to the inferior societies.

Crawfurd was here introducing an issue which would be discussed at depth in his Essay preceding the Malay Grammar and Dictionary in 1852, viz. that of *synonyms* – whether the prevalent term used in a language to designate an idea or an object was also both *the original term in this language* and *original to the language*, such as the terms contained in the *word list* were a priori assumed to be by its propagators. Apart from being autochthonous to a language, a term could also have been introduced from another language either: 1) alongside the introduction of the new idea or object which it designated; 2) as designating an idea or object already existent in the recipient society which also had a term for this, but this term had then been supplanted altogether by the newly introduced one; or 3) as designating an idea or an object already existent and being present in the language together with the original term, and perhaps with other, earlier introduced terms as well, and where they were all existing synonymously with each other. The problem here would obviously be to establish whether the only (identified) term for such an idea or object in any given language should also be considered the *original* one, or whether it had been imported from another language; or, in the case of synonyms, to establish which one was the *original* one.<sup>2</sup>

Here we encounter an absolutely fundamental methodological discrepancy between Marsden and the propagators of the word list on the one hand, and Crawfurd on the other. To Marsden an identity or a sufficient similarity (a *manifest connexion*) meant an undeniable indication of a common origin and a genealogical affinity, if the term referred to one of the *simple ideas* contained in the word list. To Crawfurd, however, this would instead more likely be perceived as linguistic evidence testifying to the dissemination of civilization, resulting in either 1) the introduction of new ideas, like e.g.

---

*analogical example of the presence of Sanskrit synonyms to Malay or Javanese terms, providing a similar case of the presence of non-genealogically affiliated synonyms.*

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1848a*, p.361; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Discussing this issue in the case of the languages spoken on the Philippine islands, Crawfurd concluded: “It will be seen from these examples that the words of the two languages are rarely the same; and that, when they are so, a *synonyme* will be found in one of them, seemingly implying [1] that the word which is alike has been borrowed, or still more frequently, [2] that the similar word has been taken by both from the same foreign tongue, – the Malayan language. – The foreign words so introduced are entitled to some remarks. Sometimes they occur as mere synonymes, along with the native ones, while, in many instances, they are the only words. In these last instances, they will be found to be *general or generic terms borrowed by the Philippine languages in the want of native ones.*” (*Crawfurd 1852a*, vol.I, pp.cxxv-cxxvi; my italics)

generic terms, or refined objects, like technological innovations, or 2) introducing to- or forcing upon the language of the dominated, conquered, or colonized society its own word for this idea or object. To bolster this interpretation Crawford often took recourse to arguing analogically by referring to what was considered well known and well established examples of such patterns. Besides, in the specific case of the spread of Malay throughout these regions, both Marsden and later Crawford argued that many languages voluntarily incorporated Malay words for aesthetic reasons, due to their simplicity in pronunciation and apparent ‘sweetness’ to the ear.<sup>1</sup>

Yet this consensus did not alter the fact that the methodological challenge of establishing the relations of languages on the basis of shared or similar words in the end presented an underdetermined question. That is, on the basis of the available linguistic data (and even when concurring on this), no unequivocal inference could be made before this was firmly inscribed into a larger referential framework and within this ascribed an unambiguous evidential significance. Hence, for instance, even when agreeing on the identity of the terms designating the simplest ideas like references to simple natural objects, this did not ineluctably imply that the languages involved were genealogically related unless this evidence of a *manifest connexion* of terms representing *simple ideas* were embedded in the theoretical framework surrounding, and tacitly implied, in the methodology of the word list.

To Crawford, such similarity would signify linguistic mixture through the dissemination of civilization, and genealogical affinity could only be established through identity in particles and kindred kinds of words. By professing this as constituting the only conclusive evidence, Crawford ultimately excluded himself from identifying and operating with the existence of any large scale language families bound together by genealogical ties.<sup>2</sup>

The interpretations advanced by Marsden and Crawford thus, *mutatis mutandis*, closely resembled those of Sir W. Jones and the contemporary French Jesuit missionary G.L. Coeurdoux; these were summarized by T.R. Trautmann in the following words: “Coeurdoux [Crawford] gives an explanation of language similarity through *mixture*, positing a movement from original distinctness toward similarity. Jones [Marsden] gives an explanation of language similarity through

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated in e.g. *Crawford 1852a*, p.iv, where Crawford asserted that the terms expressing simple ideas, instead of always maintaining their names as claimed by the methodology of the word list, on the contrary “this certainly does not accord with my experience of the Malayan and Polynesian languages, into which, from the simplicity of their structure, *I find that well-sounding foreign words very readily gain admission.*” (My italics)

<sup>2</sup> As demonstrated in case of J.D. Lang’s use of particles as evidence, this was not an unavoidable, logically determined outcome of this theoretical approach; but, at least in Crawford’s case, when applied more rigorously this theoretical approach and its derived methodology seemed to possess a prefiguring tendency towards only acknowledging rather small groups of undeniably related languages as being genealogically affiliated. Yet in Crawford’s case, such a cautious approach might also have been corroborated by other, non-linguistic incentives – like a general rationale focussing on civilization as the prime mover of languages and a fixist scheme in terms of race and innate racial differences.

*co-descent*, positing a movement from original unity to difference – a movement that mirrors the movement of the tree of Nations from generation to generation of patrilineal descendants.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Trautmann 2006*, p.20; the italics are Trautmann’s.



### 3. Crawford's Approaches, Theories, and Interpretations.

#### 3.1 Linguistic Amalgamation and Progress of Civilization: Crawford's Linguistic Palaeontology I.

Just like Coeurdoux, Crawford stressed that the linguistic dynamics developed from distinctness toward similarity, and not from an assumed original unity into different, yet still genealogically linked languages. In concert with his fixist view of race Crawford perceived the earliest times as characterized by a multitude of different and distinct zones of origin.<sup>1</sup> It was, in fact, in the realm of language that he made his polygenetic views most explicit from the beginning; without elaborating the issue further, he concisely stated in 1820 that:

“In the *infancy of society*, in *every part of the world*, men are broken into small communities, numerous in proportion to their barbarism, and, as they improve, tribes and hordes become nations, extensive according to the degree of their civilization. *Languages follow the same progress. In the savage state they are great in number, – in improved societies few.* The state of languages on the American continent, affords a convincing illustration of this fact, and it is not less satisfactorily explained in the fact of the Indian Islands.”<sup>2</sup>

A similar opinion was reiterated as late as in 1852 where he boldly asserted that: “As it is in Europe and on the continent of Asia, languages are, within the [Indian] Archipelago, *numerous in the inverse proportion of civilization*, and this arising from causes too obvious to require explanation.”<sup>3</sup> Or, in other words, the *burden of explanation* only befell upon discourses claiming the opposite stance. This assumption of a diminution of the number of languages with the progress of civilization formed both a continuous and fundamental aspect of Crawford's general approach to the intertwined relations between language and civilization; as such we have already touched upon this when delineating Crawford's linguistic polygenism, and when discussing his insistence on a primitive universal equality in the absence of any vestiges of civilization at the lowest and earliest stage of society. Crawford saw thus no inherent tension in stressing, on the one hand a universality of civilization, and a multiplicity of languages as emblematic for the earliest stage of mankind. The

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on this topic, see e.g. *Livingstone 1991* and *Livingstone 2010*.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.79; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawford 1852a*, p.cclii; my italics. In his last text on this topic, Crawford endeavoured even to frame this relationship in a potentially quantifiable form: “In the region inhabited by the Malay race, as in other parts of the world, the number of languages, in its several parts, will be found *few in the inverse proportion to the density of population*.” (*Crawford 1869a*, p.124; my italics) *Civilization* had here been substituted by *density of population*, but given Crawford's general perception of civilization it was clear that the density of population could be perceived as a function of the level of civilization.

spread of language was characterized, not by the growth of the number of languages through differentiation of languages and nations, but rather through a decrease caused by amalgamation.

Indeed, Crawford's attention was directed much more towards the relations between *language and society* than to a focus on *language and nation*. To Crawford the notion of nation, in the loosely and unsystematic use of the term rife then, appeared to have been considered as an organizational entity that grew out of society once this had reached a certain stage of civilization; just as he intimated when writing about "small communities" and as these "improve, tribes and hordes become nations, extensive according to the degree of their civilization."<sup>1</sup> Analytically, then, *society* held a privileged position over *nation*, the latter merely referring to a political unit of a certain size and at a certain level of civilization, and the language spoken there was a result of particular, and in the end contingent historical, events rather than representing some kind of essentialist and pristine quality.

As part of this universalist discourse, Crawford presented in HIA the following sketch of how society and language developed jointly and with latter following in the trail of the former:

"It is instructive and interesting to advert to *the history of joint improvement of society and language*,<sup>2</sup> and to attend to the circumstances under which a community is increased, in strength, number, and civilization, while the numerous dialects of the first savages unite to the formation of one more copious and improved tongue. Such a history would be pretty as follows: – One tribe raised above its neighbours by circumstances natural or fortuitous, would conquer one or more of these, – adopting, as in savage society, the conquered as captives. The tribe would be increased in numbers and strength to enable it to undertake new conquests. The languages of the conquered and the conquerors would amalgamate, the latter chiefly giving it its form and character. Progressive conquests of this nature would, in the course of ages, though after many reverses and fluctuations, reduce a country under the sway of one people, and reduce to one its many dialects. The necessity of supporting an increasing population would be the incentive to industry, invention, and improvement, and, in this manner, *we can trace the progress of the savage state to semi-barbarism*, until some natural obstacle, as the barrier of seas and mountains, interrupted the geographical progress of improvement. This, in short, is the progress of society in every part of the world."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.79.

<sup>2</sup> The pairing and assumed entwined dynamics of these occupied an important position in British discourses on progress and improvement from the 18th C. and onwards. D. Spadafora has pointed out how theories in the 18<sup>th</sup> C. linked linguistic improvement causally to progress in civilization, and at the same time saw linguistic improvement as a short cut to accelerate the rate of progress; it was in this light that the heated debates on language in Britain from S. Johnson and H. Tooke and onwards should be assessed. (*Spadafora*, pp.194-210)

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.95-96. My Italics. This example is also mentioned in *Rendall*, p.56.

This constituted the rule, even though there were examples of such linguistic specificity (and especially in the cases of typological divergences) as in itself offering an obstacle to the dissemination of civilization by hampering the spread of language – a main facilitator of civilization. Crawford thus explained the halt of dissemination of Malay and its kindred languages on the Asian mainland in terms of an impermeable typological language-barrier between this region and the insular part of Southeast Asia,<sup>1</sup> otherwise resembling each other so in many aspects. In this approach Crawford was repeating J. Leyden's emphasis on the qualitative discrepancy between the monosyllabic languages of the Indo-Chinese nations and the polysyllabic Malay.<sup>2</sup> And conversely, Crawford seemed to have perceived the dissemination of Sanskrit elements in the more civilized languages in the Indian Archipelago as facilitated by their shared polysyllabic structures.<sup>3</sup>

Such a general approach was obviously contrary to the assumptions ingrained in the genealogical model where confrontation and interaction with other languages by and large remained outside the analytical scope. In the context of the earliest migrations of man, or of the first occupations of any given territory, the whole idea of such interactions obviously seemed irrelevant – at least as long as a strictly monogenetic theory was upheld. Language differences were primarily explained as a process of differentiation roughly proportional with the distance in time and space from the original-, or mother, language.

Crawford framed his approach to the dynamics of language in direct opposition to this: “It is *by conquest only* that we can suppose the languages of rude nations to produce a material influence upon each other”; this effected that “oscillation or partial and temporary conquests is constantly going forward, which produces important effects upon the language of the weaker party.” Upon this Crawford then concluded that in “this manner we account rationally for the great number of words common to all the neighbouring languages. It is the language of the more powerful and civilized tribe, which *naturally* imposes words upon the weaker.”<sup>4</sup>

Apart from flowing almost naturally from Crawford's theoretical sources, this explanative mode was regularly invoked by many colonial linguists as an authoritative counter-discourse to the one

---

<sup>1</sup> See Crawford 1834, pp.382-383; and Crawford 1852a, p.cclxxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> See Leyden 1811.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1834, p.383: “Among the nations of Polynesia [here being used in Marsden's meaning of the term – i.e. as composing all of the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific], whose languages are all polysyllabic [like Sanskrit], the Sanskrit has made an impression, greater or less, in proportion to their opportunities of receiving it; the nearest and the most polished languages having adopted it to the greatest extent. The distant and the semi-barbarous, have rejected it altogether”; in 1852, in possession of new source-material (William's “Dictionary of the New Zealand Language”, 1844) Crawford would not exclude the possibility of three Maori words of allegedly Malayan origin were ultimately derived from Sanskrit! (Crawford 1852a, p.cxli.) However on p.cclxxxv, he reiterated “the great possibility is, that the Polynesian contains none [i.e. Sanskrit derived words] at all.” Crawford later discussed the issue of the possible presence of Sanskrit words, and hence an indirect Sanskrit influence, in the Pacific together with alleged material vestiges hereof – see Crawford 1869a and Crawford 1867b. For a contextualization of 19<sup>th</sup> C. British theories on ancient Indian presence in the Pacific, see Ballantyne 2004.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp.97-98; my italics.

embedded in the genealogical framework. Errington thus emphasized how “they regularly had recourse to stories of war, conquest, and forced displacement as explanatory factors for linguistic diversity, preferring these to processes of emigration, trade, or cultural exchange”;<sup>1</sup> stories which obviously had many parallels to the colonial enterprise in which these saw themselves as the progressive protagonists.

Albeit Crawford later added commerce, piratical raids and expeditions, (peaceful) settlement, and not at least the importance of fortuitous shipwrecking of tempest-driven vessels<sup>2</sup> as crucial complimentary causes to that of conquest in the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia, his interpretation evidently still presupposed the existence scattered societies between which such modes of interaction could take place.<sup>3</sup>

### **3.2 Disentangling Language and Race.**

This focus on the dyad of language and society rather than on language and nation was undoubtedly related to Crawford’s categorical dismissal of the existence of any essential links between language and race. This disentanglement of race and language became ever more present in Crawford’s later discourses, not at least as a reaction to the frequent equating of the two in many contemporary writings. With Renan on the Continent and Max Müller in Britain as some of its prominent exponents, the idea that language not merely reflected but actually defined race gained in popularity throughout the 1850s and 1860s;<sup>4</sup> in this way “language became widely accepted as a rich and reliable source of evidence, and philology a kind of master-discipline for theorizing about human origins in general and human races in particular.”<sup>5</sup>

The emergence of an approach more grounded in physical anthropology challenged the primacy of language as the provider of the most reliable evidence of genealogical descent, and hence also as a prime indicator of racial affiliations. Although these trends in the British context would first

---

<sup>1</sup> Errington 2008, p.84. See also the illuminative analysis in Pollock’s essay. (Pollock 2000, esp. pp.603-605)

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Crawford 1848a, pp.338-339 & pp.363-366.

<sup>3</sup> Both the framework delineated by the genealogical model and Crawford’s model of interactionist amalgamation of language and culture are actually both invoked within modern interdisciplinary studies of especially the extra-European prehistory; although significantly more sophisticated in their methodological apparatus and conceptual tools, these two frameworks discussed here remain firmly embedded in the theoretical approaches which P. McConnell labels *upstream* (migration into empty or thinly populated regions) and *downstream spread* (into more densely populated regions) respectively (McConnell, pp.164-167 & pp.186-188). Many of the characteristics ascribed to each of these closely resemble those associated with the models advanced by Marsden on the one hand and Crawford on the other.

<sup>4</sup> It was in particular Renan who espoused this view most insistently (Olender, ch.4, and esp. pp.57-63: in the “age of historical facts” “language thus virtually supplanted race in distinguishing between human groups, or, to put it in another way, the meaning of the word ‘race’ changes. Race became a matter of language, religion, laws, and customs more than of blood” (p.58). See also Benes 2008, pp.221-228). Although Max Müller “spent the remainder of his career disentangling this conflation of words and bodies” (Benes 2008, p.215; see also Stocking 1987, p.59), it was precisely the connection he had made when he in 1854 “concluded that language proved the racial identity of Englishmen and elite Indians” (Benes 2008, p.214); this was reiterated in his hugely popular lectures on the “Science of Language” held at the Royal Institution of Great Britain (Alter 2005, p.63) and which were published in 2 vols. In 1861 and 1864. (See also Trautmann 1997/2004, pp.172-178)

<sup>5</sup> Harpham, p.44.

become institutionalized with J. Hunt's Anthropological Society of London, founded in 1863,<sup>1</sup> the linguistic approach had been challenged both before this date and from within the circles of the more linguistically inclined Ethnological Society itself. Crawford played a prominent part in both of these cases.

As we have seen, it can be convincingly argued that Crawford's discourses always had, at least latently, exhibited a proclivity towards treating race as an autonomous, biologically defined entity that could not in any direct manner be equated with either civilization or any kind of political structures. As such it constituted an important, but independent branch in Crawford's analytical scheme; the analysis of the impact of racial features should be co-ordinated but not conflated with the linguistic ones, the latter primarily echoing aspects associated with civilization and subsidiary with political units and perhaps with the nation. However, it seemed only to have been by the 1850s that these tacit assumptions became articulated. Whereas the article "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races" from 1848 did not elaborate on the relationship between language and race but merely carried out two parallel analyses, the "Preliminary Dissertation" to the "Malay Grammar and Dictionary" did four years later emphasize that "although language often affords valuable historical evidence, it would only lead to error to consider it as invariably identical with race."<sup>2</sup>

By the 1860s this aspect had turned into a contested nodal point around which some of the most heated debates raged. One of the most obvious instances hereof was the controversies between Crawford and F. Max Müller regarding whether supposedly shared Indo-European language traits, existent from the British Isles to the Indian subcontinent, implied common racial features too. In other words, did the British colonial masters share the same biological ancestors as those high caste Hindu sepoys that recently had mutinied against their hegemony;<sup>3</sup> did the same blood really run in their veins? Max Müller claimed so; obviously, such a politically controversial statement could not go scot-free, and some renowned linguists, like Latham and Crawford, staunchly contested it. In his paper "On the Aryan or Indo-Germanic Theory", originally read at the 30<sup>th</sup> BAAS meeting held at Oxford in 1860 and published the year after as an article in TES,<sup>4</sup> Crawford provided his most

---

<sup>1</sup> The events associated with the formation of these institutions, as well as their social, intellectual, cultural, and ideological contexts has been the subject of several studies throughout the years, and hence I will not elaborate further on this topic here; see e.g. *Burrow 1963*, *Stocking 1971*, *Weber 1974*, *Raininger 1978*, *Stocking 1987* (esp. pp.238-273), *Ellingson* (pp.235-323), *Sillitoe, Kenny, and Gondermann*.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1852a*, p.ii.

<sup>3</sup> Although Crawford's contestation of Max Müller's theory did not refer to the Mutiny or any event associated with it, there can hardly be any doubt that the cultural and ideological reminiscences following in the wake of this violent outburst also exerted a deep impact on Crawford's approach. For an analysis of the reception and re-enactment of the Mutiny in British literature, see *Brantlinger 1988* (pp.199-224). Crawford had in 1859, in the *Journal of the United Service Institution*, published a paper entitled "India, as Connected with a Native Army" which, however, did not mention the recent events (*Crawford 1859a*; the paper was read on April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1858).

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1861b*.

consistent and vitriolic assault on Max Müller's stance, theories, and methodological approach. As well G. Beer as T.R. Trautmann has diligently demonstrated the rhetorical devices by which Crawford sought to ridicule "the mere dreams of very learned men, and perhaps even more imaginative than learned",<sup>1</sup> and his appeal to the authority of the well attested British common sense incarnated in the solid institution of the jury as constituting the ultimate arbiter in this question (implying that it of course would vote in favour of his point of view).<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding that Trautmann undoubtedly had a valid point when dubbing Crawford's approach "the doctrine of racial essentialism" and stating that it implied a deep contempt for Indians and for the Indian civilization, the more substantial strand of Crawford's argument did nonetheless follow the same logics as Crawford had applied before in his discussions on the composition and relationships of the languages in the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia.

Whatever his ulterior motives may have been, Crawford did primarily engage Max Müller on linguistic grounds, despite he here once more reiterating his firm faith in the essentiality and fixity of the races,<sup>3</sup> as well as he continuously invoked a hierarchal distinction between these in terms of intellectual and physical prowess and hence ultimately in their capacity for civilizational improvement too.<sup>4</sup> Proceeding in same argumentative mode as employed against the genealogical framework inherent in Marsden's Polynesian and Prichard's Malayo-Polynesian hypotheses, Crawford rejected that the supposed evidence provided by the *methodology of the word list* did allow Max Müller, Prichard et al to infer the existence of a genealogical affinity between all the languages which they had subsumed under the heading of Indo-Germanic or Aryan. Instead of indicating a genealogical affinity, Crawford was "satisfied the words which one rude nation borrows from a more civilized one with which it holds intercourse, are *naturally and necessarily those expressing the most familiar ideas*."<sup>5</sup> Unlike the studies of the rather unknown and grammatically 'simple' languages spoken in the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia, the languages here discussed were much more thoroughly studied and possessed another grammatical structure. Indeed, Crawford had here to acknowledge that the theory of the Indo-European language family did not solely rest on evidence provided by the word list; it was seemingly furthermore corroborated by evidence extracted from "the well-ascertained principle of the commutations of sounds",<sup>6</sup> as well as by a comparative analysis of the verbal roots of these inflectional languages, such as not at least

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1861b, p.286.

<sup>2</sup> Beer, pp.82-82 and Trautmann 1997/2004, pp.180-181.

<sup>3</sup> Reiterated here on p.270 (Crawford 1861b): "Now, as far as authentic history [i.e. recorded history] carries us, no physical change has taken place in any race of man such as the theory supposes to have happened."

<sup>4</sup> "Some races, no apparently more favoured by geographical or local position, are so superior to others in bodily strength and mental endowment". (Crawford 1861b, p.270)

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1861b, p.275; my italics.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1861b, p.273. Although not mentioning him by name, Crawford seems here to be referring to the mode of phonetic analysis associated with Grimm's Law.

F. Bopp had demonstrated.<sup>1</sup> However, Crawfurd flatly denied the validity of both of these approaches on account of insufficient methodological rigour; in doing this he employed a quite cavalier and even ridiculing rhetoric. Regarding the former argument of regular sound shifts or correspondences, he stated that here “a skilful manipulator has a very wide field indeed for the exercise of his fancy and ingenuity”;<sup>2</sup> similarly, the analysis of the verbal roots “appears to me to be little better than an ingenious etymological juggle, by which any result we please can be obtained if the words compared bear any similitude to each other.”<sup>3</sup>

Crawfurd thus denied either 1) the existence of the shared linguistic traits upon which the theory of the Indo-European language family was based, or, subsidiary, 2) that these traits actually indicated a genealogical affinity. This implied a rejection of a linguistically proved racial affinity too. For without the assumption of the genealogical premise – and its accompanying idea of the dissemination of language primarily through the migration of language by its ‘carriers’<sup>4</sup> – then it would hardly make any sense to invoke shared linguistic features as indicative of shared racial origin. If language in reality often was disseminated by other means, and if the essential parts of language thus could travel across space without (substantial numbers of) its speakers did the same, then “language, although often of great value in tracing the history and migration of nations, is very far indeed from being always an infallible test of race, for [then] many races have lost their original tongues and adopted those of opposite races.”<sup>5</sup> Crawfurd reiterated this view later the same year, and it constituted the central theme of an article published four years later which was aptly entitled “On Language as a Test of the Races of Man”. Albeit he here conceded that “although language, then, be no safe guide to race, there certainly occur many cases in which they are, at least, concomitant.”<sup>6</sup>

Hence, the staunch denial of any racial affiliations between the British masters and their Indian subjects was not solely attributable to a politically motivated dissociation of these two groups based on a racial criterion, firmly grounded in biology. It also resulted from the intrinsic logic in Crawfurd’s own linguistic theories. These at least facilitated such an approach by dismissing the primacy of the genealogical approach, and by denying the existence of large, globally spread *language families*, professing a common origin and affording evidence of primordial migratory patterns.

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd quoted Bopp at length in this article (p.272). An English translation of Bopp’s “A Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic Languages” (1833-1852) had been published by J. Murray in 1854 (2 vols.).

<sup>2</sup> *Crawfurd 1861b*, p.273.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1861b*, p.282.

<sup>4</sup> I.e. the people belonging to the societies who spoke these languages.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawfurd 1861b*, p.271.

<sup>6</sup> In the first instance I refer to *Crawfurd 1861c*, see esp. pp.370-371. The quote is from *Crawfurd 1865a*, p.8.

Instead, these shared linguistic features across vast spaces attested to a subsequent dissemination of language and civilization; hence they did not in any direct manner reflect a shared racial origin. Rather, Crawfurd perceived race and language as two analytically distinct fields of study. This did not exclude the possibility of an affiliation between the two, but in such case the relation was purely contingent, and its reason should be sought in the particular historical trajectories rather than being perceived as epitomizing any intrinsic and logical connections.

This effected F.W. Farrar to write in 1869 of Crawfurd that “in spite of his own fame as a Malay lexicographer, he was always disposed to slight a linguistic argument in anthropological inquiries”, and that “Mr. Crawfurd was probably the last living man of any eminence who still refused credence to even the most indisputable discoveries of comparative philology”; thus “he was in the habit of stoutly denouncing the unity of the Aryan languages as ‘the Aryan heresy’”.<sup>1</sup>

### **3.3 Lexicography and Civilization: Crawfurd’s Linguistic Palaeontology II.**

In assessing the rate and spatial distribution of the progress of civilization in Southeast Asia Crawfurd wrote in 1856 that “intercommunication with strangers, although not the primary cause of the civilisations of the two Archipelagos [the Indian and the Philippine], contributed largely to increase them.” This intercommunication “was effected not [primarily] by invasion and conquest but by commercial intercourse and partial settlement.”<sup>2</sup> Although Indian influence had proven instrumental in introducing some of the most advanced elements of civilization, the subsequent dissemination of these elements, in conjunction with the autochthonous aspects of civilization in the region, had been undertaken by the Indian islanders themselves; Crawfurd thus asserted that “the greatest improvement which has been imparted by the Malays and Javanese to the other nations, has been derived from their own native sources. *This is proven by an examination of language*, from which it will be seen that the proportion of Malay and Javanese is always largest in the neighbourhood of Sumatra and Java, and is constantly decreasing as we increase our distance from them.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Farrar, p.252. For more on Farrar’s affiliations and controversies with Max Müller, see Alter 1999, pp.79-96.

<sup>2</sup> See Pollock 2006, esp. pp.528-538 for a recent critique of the “civilizationist discourse” implied in the theories of “Indianization (or Hinduization)”, and which followed along the same principles as those pursued in Crawfurd’s approach; these have had a protracted history right up to today within Southeast Asian historiography. See also Andaya 2008, ch.1 for a recent analysis of the insular Southeast Asian prehistory which focuses on the aspects cultural interaction and especially trade in the formation- and dynamic transformations of the *ethnic entities*, such as the *Malays*, dominating the history of the region.

<sup>3</sup> All these quotations are from Crawfurd 1856, pp.262-263, under the entry on ‘Man’. My italics. See also Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxv: “That the Malayan words, fancifully imagined to afford evidence of a kind of universal language, proceeded from Sumatra and Java is demonstrated by *the fact of their being found to diminish in amount as we recede, either by distance or by other difficulty of communication*, from those islands, and by their increasing as we approach them.” (My italics)



These assertions were symptomatic of Crawford's framing of the linguistic evidence, as well as of the inferences he drew from this. Always less interested in the spread of whole languages from one society to another than in the dissemination of different linguistic parts between these societies, Crawford did not only deny any form of analytical, or pre-empirical, linkage between race and language,<sup>1</sup> but he also ascribed a paramount importance to what later became known as *loanwords*. Indeed, he, as we have already seen, went so far as to include among the loanwords most of the terms that Marsden and the other advocates of the genealogical model deemed to be essential. Any demonstrated similarity in these terms did not, according to Crawford, reveal a shared origin; more likely it pointed to later communications and cultural exchanges between the societies sharing these terms.

"Instead of *the elementary words of language* being those most widely spread, the reverse is the case. Such words are the rarest to be found in many languages, and some of the most essential have not been disseminated at all, but are found to be distinct in each separate language. In fact, *the class of words most widely diffused, are in great measure extrinsic, and the offspring of a considerable advancement in civilization*; such, for example, as the names of cultivated, useful, or familiar plants; those of domesticated, useful, familiar animals; terms connected with enumeration, fishing, navigation, agriculture, the mechanical arts, the calendar, war, government, and even literature."<sup>2</sup>

The most substantial part of Crawford's linguistic analysis was targeted at tracing the origin, routes, and relative dates of the dissemination of the terms relating to these elements of subsistence economy and aspects of civilization – assuming as a general rule that the dissemination of the tools, technologies, practices, concepts, and institutions referred to by these terms followed the same pattern of dissemination as these.<sup>3</sup> In this manner Crawford primarily used linguistic evidence to follow the dissemination of civilization between different societies, rather than to trace the origin and diffusion of peoples, nations, or races.<sup>4</sup> Whereas the word list operated as well with "what it

---

<sup>1</sup> As he, in the context of the languages and their modes of dissemination in the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific, explicitly refuted in 1852, and then repeated this refutation almost verbatim in 1856: "It [the genealogical and diffisionist theory of language] supposes, for example, that languages and race are identical, taking it, of course, for granted, that men are born with peculiar languages as they are with peculiar complexions; and *that both are equally unchangeable*". Many well known events of authentic history refute this notion" (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.ii-iii & Crawford 1856, p.211 (entry on 'Language') My italics) Hence, "although language often affords valuable historical evidence, it would only lead to error to consider it as invariably identical with race." (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.iii)

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1848a, pp.362-363. My italics. Crawford's elementary words of language thus differed essentially from Marsden's terms expressive of *simple ideas*!

<sup>3</sup> Although he did acknowledge that this methodological mode of procedure was not infallible – newly introduced terms could, as it has already been discussed, also merely replace already existent ones or act as synonyms for these.

<sup>4</sup> J.L. Myres was thus, in my opinion, at best only partially right when he stated that Crawford was among the very first to systematically apply "the new science of comparative philology to the principal linguistic groups of the Pacific, Polynesia, and Malay", and to "argue that if two peoples retained the same names for things, they must be held to have had those things in use and in mind, before they became separated in language and or abode." (Myres, pp.59-60) The

excludes from the list, namely, those words corresponding to more complex ideas, words of art and science that develop through commerce with other nations”,<sup>1</sup> as with what it actually analysed, Crawford’s approach on the contrary focussed on exactly these elements excluded in the word list. What he was mapping was not as much the mass movement of people and the thus effected replacement or displacement of other people as the movement of technologies and ideas associated with a stadial notion of civilization; notwithstanding whether these were disseminated by peaceful practices like trade and travel or by more martial means as conquest and colonization.

As a general rule it was supposed that the direction of the influence was almost exclusively a top-down one; power and civilization seemed to walk hand in hand in Crawford’s theory. “The assumption made in favour of the Malay and Javanese nations is entirely consonant to the history of diffusion of languages in other parts of the world. The diffusion in every case has been effected, *not by rude or weak nations, but by civilised, powerful, and enterprising ones.*”<sup>2</sup> This was clearly demonstrated in the case of the dissemination of Malay and Javanese language elements in the Indian Archipelago, as well as partially on Madagascar and in Polynesia; Crawford confidently asserted that “wherever they have been received, the Malays and Javanese will be found in a higher state of civilization than the nations into whose languages theirs have been adopted. Wherever, on the contrary, the nations with whom they have held intercourse have been in a higher state of civilization than themselves, their languages have been rejected, and the languages of those nations even adapted into their own.”<sup>3</sup> Hence both the Malay and in particular the Javanese language was saturated with elements of Sanskrit that had been inculcated into these languages by the more civilized Sanskrit speaking colonists who especially had settled on this island more than a thousand years ago.<sup>4</sup>

---

latter assertion implied a genealogical framework which would explain linguistic affinities in terms of *original unity – subsequent diversity* due to distance in time and space: precisely the model used by Marsden et al and which Crawford explicitly rejected in his discourses on linguistic matters!

<sup>1</sup> Trautmann 2006, p.27.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxiii; my italics. After having enumerated some analogical examples, Crawford mused on the manner in which Sanskrit had been diffused: “The people, whoever they may have been, of whom Sanskrit was the vernacular tongue, contrived, *through the instrumentality of religion, literature, trade settlement*, and in some situations, probably also of *conquest*, to intermix their tongue, in more or less quantity, with all the languages of Hindustan, and of many of the countries around it, extending even to some of the remotest of the Indian islands.” (My italics)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.356.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.xxxix-clviii for a discussion of the Sanskrit influence on Java, its source, routes, and the period where it blossomed. Contrary to the pronounced influence of Sanskrit upon most of the languages in the region – notably upon Malay, Javanese, and in particular upon the ‘sacred’ Kawi language – the long lasting trade links between the highly civilized China and Southeast Asia, as well as the massive influx of Chinese people and culture to the region, did not leave any profound traces in any of the languages. Crawford, like most of his contemporaries, ascribed this absence to the almost insurmountable typological discrepancies between the polysyllabic ‘Polynesian’ (Austronesian) languages and the monosyllabic Chinese. (see e.g. HIA, Vol.II, p.118: “The languages [i.e. Chinese and those of the Archipelago] have been hindered from mixing, by difference of religion and manners on the part of the people, and of *genius in that of their languages – the one uncouth and monotonous, the other smooth and harmonious*” [my italics]); Crawford 1848a, pp.373-374, and especially Crawford 1852, pp.cclxxxvii-cclxxxviii: “They [i.e. the

The linguistic impact made upon the receiving society depended not solely upon the discrepancy in civilization between the interacting societies, but also on the ‘intensity’ of the interaction between them: “*If the cause has been feeble the diffusion of language will be of small amount, and if powerful it may amount, not only to intermixture alone, but even to total suppression of the native idiom. Of all this, the Malay and Javanese languages afford examples on an obscure field, which are parallel to those which the Asiatic and European languages exhibit on conspicuous ones.*”<sup>1</sup> Such dynamics of language and culture could indeed be observed in present day Borneo, and Crawfurd commented on this: “There is, in fact, going on in Borneo the same kind of process, on a small scale, which on a great one obliterated the languages of Ancient Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and substituted the languages of the Roman conquerors.”<sup>2</sup>

Ascribing a universal validity to this dynamics of civilization – as almost automatically moving from the allegedly superior to the inferior societies through travel, trade, conquest, or colonization – did evidently carry connotations to Crawfurd’s own time: ideologically, this rhetoric served to *naturalize* colonialism by presenting it as constituting the primary mover in the historical dynamics throughout all times. Colonialism brought civilization. Furthermore, this rhetoric did not present the by now stagnating (or outright degenerated) societies, encountered by the British in Southeast Asia, as the legitimate inheritors of some pristine and unspoiled Southeast Asian national essence, now being violently infringed upon by foreign invaders; on the contrary, all these societies were themselves earlier results of this historical dynamics of peaceful interaction, conquest, and colonization. Hence these societies – themselves arisen by conquest and ethnic as well as linguistic amalgamation – seemed to possess as little claim to representing an *original* essence of the land they inhabited as the British did! What redeemed the colonizing aspirations of the British was the only factor that really mattered in this discursive rationale, viz. that of a superiority in civilization. In a certain manner they thus represented a secular civilizing mission.

Central to Crawfurd’s approach was thus the emphasis on the *mixed nature* of both societies and languages, brought about by a continuous dissemination of civilization, whether by peaceful means or through force. This was accompanied by a relative downplaying of the aspect of essentialist *originality*. Crawfurd encountered in Southeast Asia and Polynesia an exceptionally rich venue for this kind of linguistic research. Based on material borrowed from not at least Crawfurd, W. von

---

languages] refuse to amalgamate or intermix, of which we have some striking proofs”, ... “It cannot, at the same time, be said that the *Malayan nations* have borrowed nothing from the Chinese, for they have imitated some of their customs and arts, and adopted their more precise system of wrights and monies. *But to express what they have borrowed, with a few exceptions, they use their own polysyllabic language.*” [my italics] Despite using a slightly different terminology, the analytical continuity was thus pronounced in Crawfurd’s approach throughout all these years as testified in these excerpts. For more on the theories on the Chinese language during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., see e.g. Joseph 1999; Liu, pp.181-209; and Hillemann, ch.4)

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxiv; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, p.lxxxiii.

Humboldt had also, after all, chosen the Javanese Kawi language as the focal point for his linguistic analysis that precisely emphasizing the mixed character. This mixed character facilitated Humboldt's dissection of the various linguistic components and his analysis of their respective functions and entwined relations.<sup>1</sup> However, whereas W. von Humboldt used the mixed character of these languages in Southeast Asia to demonstrate a universally valid analytical primacy of the typological dimension of language, Crawfurd's analysis focussed especially on the mixed character on the lexicographical level. In W. von Humboldt's theoretical approach the mixed composition of the Kawi vocabulary was indicative of the specific historical trajectories that had given the language its present shape;<sup>2</sup> yet, its basic linguistic affinity and the prefiguring *world-view* with its associated modes of thought were both determined and fundamentally framed by the structures inherent in the linguistic typology. Vocabulary, in this context, represented little more than a linguistic surface phenomenon.

For a staunch materialist and universalist like Crawfurd it was not as much the function of *language as constitutive of thought* that mattered as its ability to mirror the stadial progress of civilization; and not at least the possibility it offered of tracing the sources from whence civilization stemmed as well as reconstructing its routes of dissemination. This could be done by identifying affinities in the terminology designating objects, arts, institutions, or ideas perceived to be indicative of the progress of civilization, and then by tracing the linguistic origin of these terms. It was these terms that constituted Crawfurd's own *word list of civilization*: the class of words that would "indicate the first and necessary steps in the progress of civilization".<sup>3</sup> Translating from A. Balbi's "Atlas Ethnographique du Globe", T. Hodgkin wrote in 1827 that:

"Does he [i.e. the linguist] wish to know from what people any nation has derived its civilization, he examines the names of its *domestic animals*, of its *cultivated fruits and vegetables*; – the names of *metals* and of *agricultural and other instruments*; and the words which stand for *metaphysical and moral ideas, and which relate to divinities, sacrifices, and ceremonies; to ranks government, war, legislation, commerce, navigation, literature and the sciences*; he compares them with the corresponding words of other languages, and if he finds one with which they are identical, or to which they bear a great similarity, he

---

<sup>1</sup> As H. Liebersohn wrote in his contrasting of Humboldt's approach with Herder's: "but Herder's organic ideology had no place in his [Humboldt's] thought; instead his philosophy of language emphasized the formation of language through borrowing. Kawi interested him as a case of cultural synthesis... Kawi exemplified the marrying of foreign and indigenous cultures", and hence it provided him with the model specimen the study of creativity through linguistic interaction. (Liebersohn, p.220)

<sup>2</sup> Errington 2008, pp.66-68.

<sup>3</sup> HIA, vol.II, p.82.

concludes that from that one the nation which is the object of his researches has received its primitive civilization, its religion, its political system, or its literature.”<sup>1</sup>

Albeit framing them in more general terms than Crawfurd, Balbi was here virtually echoing what Crawfurd had stated in HIA six years earlier.<sup>2</sup> However, whereas Balbi and his English reviewer, Hodgkin, both addressed the question of how to identify and trace the dissemination of civilization through the medium of language as *one* part among several others of their linguistic and ethnological researches, this theme acquired a methodological primacy in Crawfurd’s approach; this constituted the theoretical *leitmotif* in his linguistic, ethnological, and historical treatises throughout his entire career. Examples hereof were already abundant in all the relevant chapters in HIA, yet this theme reached its systematic apogee in the Introductory dissertation to his “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language”; the second part of this dissertation was comprised of “some observations on the migrations or wandering through which such words<sup>3</sup> have come to be disseminated. In this inquiry *language must afford the chief evidence*; but I shall endeavour to draw assistance from the ascertained character of the various tribes concerned,<sup>4</sup> and from the physical characteristics of the countries<sup>5</sup> they occupy.”<sup>6</sup> Within this diffusionist scheme Crawfurd assessed that “it is to be supposed that any *civilisation* worth adopting by other nations, *must have begun and spread in the Indian Archipelago, as in other parts of the globe*<sup>7</sup>, from one or more given points, and as the Malay and Javanese languages are the only two that are mixed with the languages of distant tribes, I have placed the foci from which such civilisation emanated in the great islands of Sumatran and Java, the principal nations of which were far in advance of all the neighbours when authentic information respecting the Archipelago was first obtained.”<sup>8</sup> On the next approximately 100 pages Crawfurd traced this spread of civilization throughout this great insular region through a thorough analysis of the terminology associated with the progress of civilization.

Crawfurd divided this civilization indicating terminology into different categories which were then applied consistently and systematically in the analysis of all the languages spoken in the region; these categories consisted of terms associated with:

---

<sup>1</sup> Hodgkin 1827, p.386; my italics. This quote was in Balbi’s text itself, here reviewed by Hodgkin, preceded by an instruction of *how to determine the genealogical affinity* between *nations* through the medium of language; in this process Balbi took recourse to the methodology implied in the *word* list, and he repeated the terms referred to by Marsden in this context. (Balbi 1826, p.lxiv)

<sup>2</sup> HIA, vol.II, pp.82-83. Balbi had, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, lauded Crawfurd as a ‘savant’ and an ‘excellent judge’ who had written the both ‘interesting’ and ‘memorable’ HIA, rather than merely as a compiler of information on the Indian Archipelago.

<sup>3</sup> I. e. Malay and Javanese terms associated with the progress of civilization.

<sup>4</sup> Not at least those deemed to be ingrained in their allegedly different racial qualities.

<sup>5</sup> Such as the physical factors of geography, climate, environment, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, p.clxxxii. My italics.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Crawfurd’s article from 1834, which claimed a *polygenism of civilizations* when viewed on the global scale.

<sup>8</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, p.clxxxiii; my italics.

- The domestication of useful animals.
- The cultivation of plants.
- The use of metals.
- The mechanic arts and domestic manufactures.
- Navigation and commerce.
- The art of war.
- Time and calendar.
- Numerals.
- Mythology and games.
- Law and government.
- Letters and literature.

The systemized manner in which Crawford proceeded in this analysis was indicative of his theories on language, as well as his ideas on the composition of civilization. Characteristically, these terms were predominantly *nouns*, although some verbs and adjectives had been included in the analysis too; however, the analysis seemed to be rigorously restricted to the level of the word; hence the possibility of appreciating sentences, or other linguistic constructions, that expressed the same as the terms referred to here, were a priori left entirely out of the analysis. Obviously this approach also presupposed an *effability*,<sup>1</sup> at least within the linguistic realms of civilization. It presupposed that all terms associated with civilization could, and would, be explicitly expressed in the languages analysed here. As discussed earlier, it also operated with an assumption of an isomorphic relation between ideas and words, so that any idea associated with the progress of civilization was 1) universally the same throughout all societies, and 2) all these could, and did, express these ideas with one lexical term only!<sup>2</sup>

In terms of the composition of civilization, the word list moved gradually from a supposed basis, composed of factors related to the subsistence economy and simple production, towards a superstructure concerned with aspects of societal organization, means of communication, and concepts rooted in a more abstract thought.

The manner in which Crawford defined and assessed the category of the *art of war* appears to be illustrative of the approach; it included as well a technological, as an organizational, as a conceptual

---

<sup>1</sup> That is, the principle “according to which a natural language can express anything that can be thought” (*Eco 1995*, pp.23-4); see also *Paxman 2003*, pp.239-240 on the importance of this principle in the context of the aspects of universalism and particularity within W. von Humboldt’s linguistic theories.

<sup>2</sup> As discussed earlier, this approach was at odds with the sensibility towards ‘linguistic relativity’ that Crawford had expressed in his analysis of the verb structures in the Philippine languages, and the criticism he had launched against the tendency of the Spanish missionaries to insist on analysing these within the Procrustean bed of Latin grammar which unduly forced these languages to comply with the structure inherent in Latin.

level. The first level alluded to terms describing the kind of weapons possessed and the ways these were used,<sup>1</sup> and the second level included terms referring to the types of organization of warriors into something resembling armies<sup>2</sup> and the modes in which such were deployed. In both cases, the word list supplied by Crawfurd in 1852 seemed to suggest that whenever the terms referred to the assumed more fundamental, or basic, aspects of warfare, then they were of a purely autochthonous origin, whereas the more sophisticated aspects or instruments usually were denominated by words of either Javanese or Malay origin – or perhaps they even had a Sanskrit name, pointing to an origin of the weapon outside of the region.<sup>3</sup> The same happened with regard to the more conceptual level of the art of war: indeed, the very words for *war* and *enmity* seemed to be derived from Sanskrit. This seemed to indicate that the concepts corresponding to these terms either 1) did not exist in the region before they were introduced along with the Sanskrit language by the influx of civilization from the Indian subcontinent, or 2) if they had existed before the introduction of the Sanskrit terms, then these had entirely substituted any earlier existing term referring to such concepts, and this could be perceived as evidence of the profound influence that Sanskrit language and civilization had exerted upon these societies.

The concept of *war* implies the existence of its dichotomic counterpart, *peace*, too, as well as an ability to distinguish between these two, at least on a categorical level – even though in reality they may often be muddled and more or less entwined. Such terms as *war*, and the accompanying one of *enmity*,<sup>4</sup> hence required a level of abstraction that would be an infallible sign of a rather advanced civilization; a level of civilization that this region apparently had not attained by itself, but which was introduced from the outside if linguistic evidence was to be trusted. Although Crawfurd did not state this explicitly in his discourse, it seemed to be a natural corollary to his argument, especially when we consider what he both here and elsewhere had stated about the conditions characterizing

<sup>1</sup> See *HIA*, Vol.I, pp.222-228. In 1852, it was ascertained that “in so far as weapons are concerned, we may conclude from the enumeration of the given [in the word list above], that the Indian islanders were, ..., at least as well-armed as the Gauls and Germans of Cæsar, without, however, possessing the same courage or skill in the use of arms.” *Crawfurd 11852a*, Vol.I, p.cxciii).

<sup>2</sup> Both in 1820 and again in 1856 Crawfurd stressed that “an army in the Malayan countries is, as in all rude stages of society, a mob composed of the followers or retainers of the chiefs, every adult being supposed to be a soldier.” (*Crawfurd 1856*, p.445 [under the entry on ‘War’]; see also *HIA*, Vol.I, pp.221-222)

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, pp.cxcii-cxciii.; the example Crawfurd gave of this was the word for ‘bow’ which was derived from Sanskrit.

<sup>4</sup> On the truly dichotomic relationship between the *definitions* of ‘war’ (‘non-peace’) and ‘peace’ (‘non-war’), as well as the correlated notions of ‘enemy’ and ‘friend’, Carl Schmitt had in a text entitled “Corollarium 2” from 1938, and attached to the 1963 edition of “The Concept of the Political” stated that: “Wo Krieg und Feindschaft sicher bestimmbare und einfach feststellbare Vorgänge oder Erscheinungen sind, kann alles, was nicht Krieg ist, eo ipso: Friede, was nicht Feind ist, eo ipso: Freund heißen. Umgekehrt: wo Friede und Freundschaft selbstverständlich und normal das Gegebene sind, kann alles, was nicht Friede ist: Krieg, und was nicht Freundschaft ist: Feindschaft werden. Im ersten Fall ist der Friede, im zweiten Fall der Krieg von dem bestimmt Gegebenen her negativ bestimmt. Im ersten Fall ist aus demselben Grunde Freund der Nicht-Feind, im zweiten Falle Feind der Nicht-Freund.” (I have not been able to locate an English translation of this text; for a Danish edition, see *Schmitt 2002*, p.158) Whether it was ‘war’ or it was ‘peace’ which was then defined positively, and its conceptual counterpart hence defined negatively (as either ‘non-war’ or ‘non-peace’), appeared to depend upon what was considered to constitute the *normal* state of mankind.

mankind in his most primitive stage. Even if the concept of war signalled a certain level of civilization, and war thus in a certain sense did not exist before its name had been coined and the corresponding concept framed, this did *not* imply that mankind before this did not know or practice violence.<sup>1</sup> Crawford was definitely no believer in the benevolence of the noble savage who had only later been depraved by civilization and deprived of his inborn dignity;<sup>2</sup> man *in* nature, if not necessarily *by* nature, was definitely a violent creature.<sup>3</sup> Even though T. Ellingson may have been aiming a bit over the target when he claimed that Crawford actually had created the myth of ‘myth of the noble savage’ in the late 1850s, and had ascribed its alleged origin to Rousseau in order to establish a rhetorical straw-man who could later easily be debunked,<sup>4</sup> it remained clear, nonetheless, that Crawford, long before the articles published in the TES during the 1860s, perceived primitive man as lingering on in a Hobessian state of perpetual warfare, or more precisely of *indiscriminate violence*, equal all over the world in his misery, distrust, and hostility.<sup>5</sup> In their characteristic mode of circular reasoning, the stadial theories of civilization both presupposed and implied a notion of an *ignoble savage*, as it has been convincingly argued by R.L. Meek.<sup>6</sup> And it was the same kind of circularity that facilitated the inferences that Crawford drew from the linguistic evidence provided by the data in his word list which, beforehand, had been structured according to the principles immanent in these stadial theories. All the terms included in Crawford’s word list referred to objects, arts, institutions, or ideas belonging to each their level of civilization. Through the

---

<sup>1</sup> The question whether man by nature is violent, or whether this is only a deviation from the norm (cf. the discussion above regarding the most adequate definitions of *war* and *peace*), is still a highly contested issue; J. Keegan thus writes in his “A History of Warfare” about the cogent impact of the “Seville Declaration” from 1986 which stipulated the fundamentally non-violent (peaceful!) nature of man; at the other end of the scale we have anthropologists like N. Chagnon who claimed that his studies of the Yanomamö, settled along the Orinoco river, amply ‘proved’ man’s fundamentally violent behaviour. (Keegan, pp.117-161. see also Gyru and Keeley)

<sup>2</sup> Crawford had introduced his chapter on the “Art of War” in the HIA by stating that: “There is so little diversity in the mode of conducting wars among communities in the lowest stages of civil existence in every part of the world, that an account of it among one or two tribes is an account of it among all. We are familiar with the disgusting picture, as it presents itself among the savages of America, and I rest satisfied, that the hostilities of the savages of the Indian islands, did we possess the most intimate knowledge of them, would afford very little variety. This knowledge, however, we do not possess in any authentic degree, for the peculiar circumstances under which we are placed, with the relation to the least improved portion of the inhabitants of the Indian islands, deny us the means. They are driven to a distance from us, by the persecution of their more powerful and civilized countrymen, and the peculiar ferocity of the manners of most of them is calculated to discourage all peaceable intercourse with them.” (HIA, Vol.I, pp.220-221)

<sup>3</sup> Thus, Crawford nowhere ascribed man’s martial instincts as innate and a result of, for instance, the original sin, such as theological literature had often done since the days of St. Augustine; rather, man was equipped with the “power of self-preservation” (Crawford 1861a, pp.155-156) which, in situations of scarcity (endemic, especially in the more primitive stages), would invariably cause strife and an internecine state of violence.

<sup>4</sup> This was the core argument advanced in Ellingson, chapters 13-19 and which was especially emphasized in ch.17. I quite agree with Vanessa Smith when she, in a review of Ellingson’s book, stated that, with regard to the part played by Crawford, “it is a subtle and persuasive argument, though one undermined in some of its more detailed exposition”. (Smith 2004, p.98)

<sup>5</sup> For a recent discussion of the more contemporary debates on this topic within anthropology, evolution psychology, etc., see Gyru; his information on Crawford appeared to be solely derived from what Ellingson wrote.

<sup>6</sup> See Meek, esp. Chapters 3-5 for the British context. Although Meek’s study was confined to the Age of Enlightenment, Crawford’s approach can, as I have continuously argued, in most of the important aspects be seen as continuing or extrapolating the tenets founded here.



linguistic evidence furnished by the word list it could then be demonstrated that each level of civilization could be ascribed to a wave, or influx, of probably people and definitely their language with its implied notions of civilization. This produced at least three main levels of civilization: a unique and autochthonous component present in each part of this vast insular region; a Javanese or Malay component disseminated among all the more advanced societies in the whole region, the Pacific included;<sup>1</sup> and among the most civilized societies words derived from Sanskrit designating components and concepts of an Indian provenance.

As such the approach was entirely consistent with Crawford's general conceptualization- and analysis of civilization, and it evidently displayed his continued commitment to the tenets of the stadial models of civilization. The tendency towards a growing systematization of the word list in Crawford's analysis also seemed to reflect a more general pattern. Thus, from relying in 1820 upon the theories and methods of conjectural history to provide the opportunity of applying an *analogical reasoning* – given the “absence of even the most trifling record”<sup>2</sup> – in the discernment of the origin and dissemination of civilization and language, the assumptions inherent in this approach had by 1852 become so reified that they could buttress a firm and undisputed methodology of structuring and interpreting linguistic data with what rhetorically was presented as scientific certainty. In other words, what earlier had belonged to the hypothetical realm of informed and enlightened historical conjecture underwent a discursive transformation into furnishing a categorical, and apparently undisputed, premise upon which scientific inferences could be made.

This growing systematization hence seemed to reflect a *rigidification* of the applied analytical categories; this was accompanied with a growing tendency of disciplining the fields of knowledge covered by these, by rendering them into ‘science’ through an inscription of these into a more unambiguous discourse relying upon a fixed, and allegedly exhaustively defined, nomenclature which mirrored the stringent analytical approach. Yet, what was thus gained in analytical stringency was at times lost in interpretive flexibility, and any utterances of methodological aporia seemed to disappear altogether from the texts themselves.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It was this level that Crawford in 1820 had labelled the ‘Great Polynesian’, a term he later abandoned (See *HIA*, Vol.II) and replaced with a dissemination of Javanese and Malay linguistic and civilizational influence.

<sup>2</sup> *HIA*, vol.II, p.93.

<sup>3</sup> Such an *interpretive flexibility* did obviously not provide an unproblematic approach in itself; as well as permitting a potential awareness of the more particular and unique aspects of each society and allowing these to be implemented into the analysis without undue distortion, it also contained an inherent potential for ad hoc explanations, tailor-made to fit an a priori formed opinion. Or, as J. Rendall summed up: “The danger lay in the temptations of the ‘conjectural’ method, the lack of rigour of the methods employed by some [of the Scottish orientlists]. Yet, for a time, the only way to pursue this ‘philosophical’ approach to the study of language seemed to be with the tools provided by Smith and Stewart; and when these were overtaken by the new methods of German philology, the Scots proved receptive.” (*Rendall*, p.58) This was certainly the case with Crawford, albeit his general theoretical framework remained much the same throughout the whole period.

### **3.4 Discerning Levels of Linguistic Interaction: Crawford's 'Cluster Theory'.**

The probably most distinctive feature of Crawford's language theory and its applied uses was its unabashed commitment to a linguistic polygenism; even if Crawford did not stress this point too overtly in 1820, it nonetheless remained an evident implication of the larger argument and the general tenor of the text. And later on it attained a foremost importance in his linguistic discourses, as we have continuously addressed earlier in this Part.

#### **3.4.1 Loanwords, Waves of Diffusion, and Levels of Civilization.**

One direct consequence of this approach was the markedly different linguistic dynamics which seemed to characterize the origin, spread, and interaction of languages in this approach when compared to a monogenetic and/or genealogical model. Crawford's emphasis on the dissemination of *loanwords* associated with the progress of civilization was obviously equally applicable to a genealogical model as it was to his own; this was amply illustrated by both the studies of languages and ethnology in India,<sup>1</sup> and by Marsden's researches on the languages of the Indian Archipelago.<sup>2</sup> This fundamental distinction between civilization indicating loanwords and terms assumed autochthonous to each language, and which were crucial to the genealogical approach, seemed to date a least back to the mid-17<sup>th</sup> C and to Marcus van Boxhorn who, however, mainly focussed on the genetic relationships between languages.<sup>3</sup> Whereas the dissemination of these loanwords to Crawford represented the most important aspect of the linguistic dynamics, it had always remained of a rather secondary importance within the genealogical approach. Or, as R. Blench recently remarked on the situation even today, "the study of lexical items that reflect introductions [of new instruments, institutions, technologies, etc.] is definitely perceived as a less prestigious activity".<sup>4</sup> In the application of a theoretical framework that emphasized the importance of the progress of civilization and ascribed a methodological primacy to the *loanwords*, Crawford seemed to have a kindred spirit in his compatriot and fellow Orientalist, Vans Kennedy. Using a rhetoric that stressed the distance between his own, allegedly, sound analysis and the absurd etymologies in which earlier generations of philologists so often indulged, Kennedy invoked a discourse almost identical with Crawford's; focussing on the same conceptual approach and methodological distinctions, he stated as a universally valid rule that:

---

<sup>1</sup> These aspects has been thoroughly examined by Trautmann in his many recent studies; see e.g. *Trautmann 1997/2004*, ch.5, *Trautmann 2005* (esp. p.xxv), and *Trautmann 2006*, ch.1 & ch.5.

<sup>2</sup> Which constituted the main argument in *Marsden 1798*, as it has already been discussed in Part II; see also *Marsden 1812*, vol.I, pp.xxii-xxxii for a repetition of this argument based on new information and for a rejection of Leyden's argument.

<sup>3</sup> *Blench*, pp.63-64; see also pp.53-55, and *Simone*, pp.164-165.

<sup>4</sup> *Blench*, p.64. He continued by stressing that: "in terms of the reconstruction of prehistory, the tracking of loanwords can provide much information that is unavailable through other means."

“It is, however, in tracing the origin of such words as the last, that etymology might be applied with the most philosophical of purposes. For, in the progress of civilisation and knowledge, *all people* have found it more convenient to employ words already in use for the expression of new ideas, than to invent new terms as they became requisite. Hence, by ascertaining the primitive word and its original signification, and then tracing it through all its modifications and varieties of meaning, *the process by which a people has proceeded from the observation of sensible objects unto discrimination of the most subtle operations of the mind, or the precise point at which this process stopped, may be investigated with the utmost certainty.* In the same manner *the progress which a nation has made in the useful and ornamental arts, and whether these have been invented in the country or received from strangers, are equally demonstrated by its language.*”<sup>1</sup>

Crawfurd had already in 1820 emphasized the *composite and layered nature* of the different languages spoken in the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific instead of stressing their *original* element which, according to him, was invariably always of a very limited geographical extension. He had thus in all “the languages of the more improved tribes of the Archipelago” identified up to seven layers: 1) “the *primitive language* of the rude horde with which the tribe *originated*, which may be looked upon as the *radical portion of the language*; 2) “the great Polynesian language” which, by 1852, had been abandoned as an analytic unit, and instead the linguistic layer was perceived as “being chiefly derived from the languages of the two most civilised and adventurous nations of the Archipelago, – the Malays and Javanese”;<sup>2</sup> 3) “the language of the tribe or tribes in

<sup>1</sup> Kennedy, p.270; my italics. Most of the text quoted here is also reproduced and discussed in Rendall, p.57. For more on Vans Kennedy’s orientalist publications and his critique of James Mill, see Koditschek 2011, pp.87-88.

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd 1852a, vol.I, pp.vii-viii. Crawfurd had repeatedly insisted on describing the Javanese as not only the most civilized society in the region, but also as a nation of people characterized by their sedentary inclinations, due to both their agricultural pursuits and a particularly strong affection to the land where their forefathers were buried. This trait was especially enounced when compared to the roving and enterprising spirit of the Malays. This seemingly rendered the habitual use of the conjunction “Malay and Javanese” in Crawfurd’s linguistic discourse somewhat problematical: their languages were admittedly different, and their general approach to the outer world equally so. Then how could they be treated as so closely intertwined, as if the dissemination of the two followed the exact same trajectory? Crawfurd acknowledged this problem and attempted to counter it by pointing to other, apparently analogical processes throughout history. “It may be objected to the explanation which I offer, that *not one, but two languages* are assumed to have been instrumental in diffusing the words which are common to so many tongues. The objection, however, falls to ground, *if the facts adduced prove that such has actually been the case. The history of language, however, affords several well-known examples of a similar proceeding.*” (Crawfurd 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxiv; my italics) The analogical examples Crawfurd here appealed to were the manner in which Greek elements had been spread with the Latin languages during the Roman conquests, how French included elements of both Latin and of Teutonic languages during the Norman conquest of Anglo-Saxon Britain, the spread of Arabic to India through the medium of Persian invaders, and finally the spread of Sanskrit within the Indian Archipelago itself through the medium of Malay. Quoting from Dumont d’Urville, Hymes, however, stressed that d’Urville in 1834 reached the opposite conclusion – viz. that the words common to Malagasy and the Polynesian dialects *are not found in Malay*”, and hence this could be taken as evidence in support of “the hypothesis that all these languages should *derive from a very ancient language, today lost*, and of which the traces have remained more or less pure and numerous in the various idioms of Oceania”. (Quoted in Hymes, p.93; my italics) This “very ancient language, today lost” would thus be identical with either the “great Polynesian language” described in HIA, or, more probably, with the proto-(Malayo)Polynesian assumed to be the

the immediate neighbourhood”; 4) “the Sanskrit or ancient language of India”; 5-7) terminology borrowed from Arabic, other Asiatic languages, and lastly from European languages.<sup>1</sup> In the example dealt with above regarding the dissemination of the terms associated with the *art of war*, we have already discussed three out of the first four layers – viz. those of the original, the Great Polynesian/Malay & Javanese, and the Sanskrit. One, however, still remains to be accounted for: the ways in which any autochthonous language would intermixture with its neighbouring languages. This layer involved not only Crawford’s idea on the dynamics of language but also his notions of what actually constituted a language; both of these aspects, in my opinion, heavily influenced his historical and ethnological interpretations, and hence it is pivotal for the understanding of the grander theoretical framework sustaining Crawford’s refutations of first Marsden’s theories on the origin and spread of the Malay language, and later of Prichard’s and Max Müller’s ethnological and linguistic ideas.

### 3.4.2 Defining, Delineating, and Demarcating a *Language*.

In the following I will examine some of the implications of Crawford’s rather narrow definition of what constituted *a language*, on how such languages could be analytically differed one from another, and on how they interacted.

Referring to H. Tooke’s linguistic theories Crawford, as we have already seen, ascribed a vital function to the particles in the construction of language. Indeed, he went so far as to advocate these as providing the foremost analytic demarcation between different languages; the decisive test existed in whether it would be possible to construct a sentence made “by words of the same origin, in two or more languages”, and if so then “such languages may safely be considered as sister tongues, – to be, in fact, dialects, or to have sprung from the same stock.”<sup>2</sup> In order to be able construct such sentences Crawford asserted that:

“The words which appear to me most fit to test the unity of languages are those indispensable to their structure, – which constitute, as it were, their framework, and without which they cannot be spoken or written. These are the prepositions which represents the cases of languages of complex structure, and the auxiliaries which represent times and moods.”<sup>3</sup>

---

*original* language in the genealogical approach pursued by Marsden, W. Humboldt, Prichard et al; Dumont d’Urville’s lexicostatistical methodology, as we will discuss later, operated within a genealogical framework.

<sup>1</sup> *HIA*, vol.II, pp.78-79; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1852a*, p.vi; my italics. This was further qualified by claiming that: “In applying this test, it is not necessary [1] that the sentence so constructed should be grammatical, or [2] that the parties speaking sister tongues should be intelligible to each other.”

<sup>3</sup> *Crawford 1852a*, pp.v-vi. See also *Crawford 1856*, p.212 for similar assertion (under the entry on ‘Language’).

Thence – instead of the terms pertaining to the *word list*, such as this was formulated by Marsden et al – the abovementioned constituted the true *radical words* indicating a genealogical affinity in Crawford's theory. The historiographical and ethnological implications of this somewhat arcane point of contestation were cogent. Even though J.D. Lang invoked an assumed similarity of the particles as evidence in support his hypothesis on the close genealogical affiliation between the peoples inhabiting Polynesia, the Indian Archipelago, the Asian mainland, and ultimately the Americas too, Crawford came to the exact opposite conclusion.<sup>1</sup> When submitted to his 'test', the particles in each language normally afforded evidence of a spatially very restricted extension of each genealogically affiliated language group or family. This, obviously, fitted neatly with his polygenetic approach and the idea that each tribe or nation originally had its own language; both 1) the polygenetic framework, and 2) the Horne Tooke inspired methodological focus on the importance of the particles were present in Crawford's discourse on language from the very beginning. Hence it seems impossible to determine whether it was this methodological approach to the genealogical affinities between languages that caused the polygenetic interpretation, or whether it was his already established polygenetic inclinations that prompted his choice of methodology.

Notwithstanding which of these that caused the other, the implication was evident: Crawford took recourse to evidence provided by these particles whenever he refuted the existence of any large, genealogically linked language family like the Indo-European language family, or the (Malayo-)Polynesian one. This insistence on the limited scope of genealogically affiliated languages became evermore present throughout the years; one example was the abandonment of the term *Great Polynesian language* as a common denominator for the shared features in all the languages spoken between Madagascar and Easter Island, and its substitution with a conjunction of Javanese and Malay linguistic elements. However, this emphasis appeared even more pronounced in the repeated rejection of the existence of genealogical language groups larger than those existing among, for instance, the Germanic or the Romanic languages in Europe.

In this context Crawford applied different *modes of analogical reasoning* as a vital element in his mode of argumentation; that is, he inferred from the supposedly well known situation in Europe to the more uncharted realms of Southeast Asia and the Pacific in terms of language, ethnology, and history. His rather controversial interpretation of the narrow genealogical relations between the European languages – which thus never exceeded the scale of e.g. the Romanic languages – thus provided his analysis of the languages in the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific with an already familiar template; this claimed that both areas were subjected to the same universally valid dynamism of original diversity in the savage state, followed by a growing tendency towards unity

---

<sup>1</sup> See Lang 1834, pp.40-48.

through the progress and dissemination of civilization and language. Upon this basis he concluded that “within the Malayan Archipelago<sup>1</sup> ... *no languages exist derived from a common stock*, and standing to each other, in the relation of sisterhood, as Italian, Spanish, and French do to each other, and from the existence of which such a parent tongue might be inferred, as Latin is to these languages.”<sup>2</sup> Hence, the linguistic diversity in this region appeared to be vastly greater than in Europe, and the spatial extension of the genealogically affiliated languages was generally of a much more limited scope.<sup>3</sup> This seemed to be consistent with both the particular geographical morphology of this insular region and with its less developed stage of civilization.<sup>4</sup>

### 3.4.3 The Exception: Tracing Genealogy and Diffusion in the Pacific.

The only exception to this tendency was the Polynesian part of the Pacific; its inhabitants, by now uniformly labelled as the Polynesian race,<sup>5</sup> were all deemed to speak genealogically affiliated languages, indicating a shared origin. Such a deviation from the explanatory mode ordinarily employed by Crawford obviously begged some further elucidation: from whence did the people speaking the proto-Polynesian language originally come, who were they – as well as when, how, and why did they undertake these vast migrations that resulted in occupying the greater part of the Pacific? Such questions had to be answered by any hypothesis claiming to account for the peopling of the Pacific through genealogy and migration, but the choice of invoking an explanatory mode that had been explicitly rejected in all other instances seemed to make the burden of explanation weigh even heavier upon Crawford’s discourse.

Whereas Crawford in 1834 did not treat the dissemination of language to the South Seas any different from that of the rest of the region,<sup>6</sup> he had by 1848 come to another conclusion. “A language *essentially the same*, is spoken in the Sandwich, the Society, the Marquesas, and the Friendly Islands, the Low Islands, Easter Island, and New Zealand”, he wrote, and “this is one of

<sup>1</sup> Here, as elsewhere in *Crawford 1856*, this term was used to refer to the western, or non-Philippine, part of the Indian Archipelago.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1856*, p.211; my italics. (Under the entry on ‘Language’)

<sup>3</sup> The limited extension of these genealogically affiliated language families could be gauged by the manner in which Crawford after an application of the *test* discussed above inferred that “Irish and [Scottish] Gaelic are proven to be virtually the same language”, and “the Welsh and American [American, or Breton Celtic] to be sister dialects of the same tongue”, whereas “it will not prove that the Welsh and Irish are sister dialects of one tongue, although they have many words in common.” (*Crawford 1856*, p.212; under the entry on ‘Language’) Crawford’s *test* thus recognized the existence of what today are known as the two subbranches insular Celtic languages, viz. the Goidelic and the Brythonic, but it did *not* recognize the larger branch of Celtic languages. (see *Hock & Joseph*, pp.43-45)

<sup>4</sup> These two aspects were explicitly emphasised in *Crawford 1856*, pp.212-213.

<sup>5</sup> See Part II, chapter 1 for a further discussion of the theories on the racial entities in the region and the question whether the inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific were racially affiliated. In 1834 Crawford did not seem to distinguish racially between the “yellow or brown complexioned” race of the Indian Archipelago and the South Sea dwellers (p.378); these were subsumed under one heading and contrasted to the Negrito and the assumed ‘third’ races. By 1848, however, as the title of the articles clearly indicated, he was making a racial demarcation between the “short and squat Malay” of the Indian Archipelago and the “tall and well-proportioned” South Sea Islanders *Crawford 1848a*, pp.330-333).

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1834*, pp.402-404; esp. p.404.

the most extraordinary phenomena in the history of language; and there is certainly nothing parallel to it, either within the Pacific itself, or the islands of the Indian Archipelago.”<sup>1</sup> At the same time it was also stressed that, apart from a (very) few civilization-indicating terms of Malayan origin,<sup>2</sup> the Polynesian languages possessed as little common ground with the languages of the Indian Archipelago as the Polynesian race did with the Malayan one. Rather than perceiving the two areas as parts of a larger region, they were by now more assessed as discrete geographical entities: each was independently defined by its own essential features (whether racially, linguistically, or historically), and they shared only one weak and contingent historical tie, the one which had left its vestige in the shape of the few shared Malay terms. This interpretation stood in stark contrast to J.C. Prichard’s continued emphasis on linguistic and racial continuity – on how they all belonged to the same “race or family of nations, since a *real kindred, or community of origin*, have been proved, by affinity of language, to exist among them”.<sup>3</sup> A race Prichard had labelled with the hyphenated term, *Malayo-Polynesian*, and which first and foremost was linguistically defined.<sup>4</sup> Despite the discrepancies regarding the profundity of the historical linkages between the Indian/Malayan Archipelago and the Polynesian Pacific – such as these could be interpreted from linguistic, racial, and antiquarian evidence – both Crawford and Prichard, however, concurred on the intrinsically identical nature of all the Polynesian languages: indeed, these could actually be perceived as mere dialects of the same language rather than genealogically affiliated, but still different, languages.<sup>5</sup>

Apart from the significant growth in available source-material – provided by the grammars, dictionaries, and vocabularies published by the many missionaries now present in especially the Pacific<sup>6</sup> – it seemed in particular to have been a more refined methodological approach to linguistic research that prompted this change of explanatory structure in Crawford’s discourse. Sharing the same grammatical and phonetic features, and not at least possessing the same *radical* words, like particles, had by now virtually forced Crawford to arrive at this conclusion;<sup>7</sup> the linguistic evidence procured through this methodological approach implied the necessity of deviating from his standard explanation of original diversity and subsequent unity through interaction. Instead the genealogical

<sup>1</sup> Both quotations are from *Crawford 1848a*, p.348; the italics are mine. See also *Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, p.ccli.

<sup>2</sup> “Among the Malayan words in the Polynesian language, it may be *very safely asserted* that there is not one which is essential to the formation of a grammatical sentence.” (*Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxliii). See also pp.358-359 in *Crawford 1856* (under the entry ‘Polynesia’), *Crawford 1867b*, p.152, and *Crawford 1868c*, pp.16-19.

<sup>3</sup> *Prichard 1843*, p.326 (repeated verbatim in p.326 in both *Prichard 1845* and *Prichard 1848*).

<sup>4</sup> In *Prichard 1847* it was conceded that this widely dispersed race was “in some instances displaying certain diversities in physical characters and manners”, yet the “decided affinity of dialects” still proved them “to be originally of one kindred.” (p.4)

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Prichard 1847*, p.102, *Crawford 1848a*, p.348, and *Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxliv.

<sup>6</sup> The changes over time in Crawford’s source-material on the Pacific languages, and the steadily growing number of references to texts produced and published by missionaries working in that region, are thus quite telling of this tendency. For more on the importance of the issue of language in the British missionary activity in the Pacific during the 19<sup>th</sup> C., see *Landau*, pp.198-202.

<sup>7</sup> *Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, pp.cxliii-cxlv.

model imposed itself as the most convenient interpretation. Another contributing factor appeared to have been the fact that the exceedingly few words of Malay origin, that Crawford had identified in the Polynesian languages, were nearly all shared (in both form and meaning) by all the Polynesian societies.<sup>1</sup> This unambiguously pointed to a shared origin of these too – otherwise the Malays would have had to have visited *all* the islands of the Polynesian part of the Pacific and imposing the exactly same words upon all the languages spoken there! Thence, within Crawford's larger referential framework, it seemed much more probable that the Proto-Polynesians had acquired these specific Malay words through interaction when still living in their original abode, before the Pacific migrations had spread them so widely. While Crawford in 1848 merely spoke of "casual wrecks",<sup>2</sup> and asserted that "conquest and settlement by the Malays, Javanese, or other tribes of the [Indian] Archipelago, had probably, therefore, nothing to do with the dissemination of the Malayan in the languages of the Pacific",<sup>3</sup> he had by 1852 reached the opposite conclusion. On the contrary, by now he stressed "that the Malayan nations effected a certain amount of settlement in the islands of the Pacific is sufficiently attested by the [1] admixture of languages, which is found in almost every tongue of these islands, [2] while its alien character is proved by their corruptions which the words have everywhere undergone. The extent to which the intermixture of Malayan has been carried, indeed, nowhere very large in the remoter languages, yet in the Polynesian, at least, *it is such as could not have taken place without some amount of settlement and intermixture of race.*"<sup>4</sup> Upon this initial assumption Crawford then launched an elaborate, and quite speculative, hypothesis<sup>5</sup> claiming that this "settlement and intermixture of race", with its accompanying infusion of Malayan words "must be inferred to have taken place while the Polynesian race was in its original hive, and before it had migrated and settled in the far-spread localities in which we now find it."<sup>6</sup> Then he offered a set of hypotheses regarding the original location of this interaction, which also must have been the original abode of the Polynesian race,<sup>7</sup> the route<sup>8</sup> and means<sup>1</sup> by which these speakers of Malay had

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cxlvi.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.369.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.368.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.ccxlvi-ccxlvii; my italics. However, the size of this inferred settlement would not have been large enough to effect a conquest and colonization; nor would it have left (m)any racial traces, instead they had been "absorbed by the mass of the population", meanwhile the linguistic vestiges survived. (p.ccxlviii)

<sup>5</sup> See Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.ccxlv-cclxiv.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.ccli.

<sup>7</sup> After lengthy considerations Crawford concluded, especially on racial grounds, that this seat of origin must be located within the Polynesian triangle and that: "But, although there be several situations greatly superior for such a purpose to others, there is none that can be said to be pre-eminently suited. We can fix, then, only on the most probable, I think that the Friendly island [Tonga], which are of sufficient extent and fertility to have produced the degree of civilisation which the Polynesians had attained, not unlikely to have been the primitive seat of the nation." (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.ccliii)

<sup>8</sup> "I think, then, that it may be conjectured that the route by which the Malayan languages and the nations that spoke them found their way to the Polynesian islands, was, most probably, by Torres Straits, – that the Friendly islands [Tonga] were among the first places touched at by the adventurers" (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.ccl-ccli)



arrived, as well as a possible dating of this interaction. The latter, he inferred, could “only be answered generally, that it must have happened at a remote one in the history of man”<sup>2</sup> – otherwise, without a protracted duration, how could the formation of the many dialects spoken on the innumerable islands be accounted for? Showing a, for him, rather unusual appreciation for the content of indigenous oral traditions, Crawford later, in 1868, traced this influence at least 1.000 years back.<sup>3</sup>

A related issue of much contestation was, as shown by T. Ballantyne, whether any of these Malay (or Malayo-Polynesian if Marsden’s, Prichard’s et al’s genealogical framework was applied) words existent in the Polynesian languages could be traced back to a Sanskrit origin.<sup>4</sup> The answer to this question was important in the dating of the arrivals of the Malays to the original location of the Polynesian race (or, in the strictly genealogical framework, of the Malayo-Polynesians to the Pacific), as well as it could convey some notions regarding the ultimate nature of the Polynesian race and civilization. Crawford did not offer any unequivocal answer to this question: in 1848 he stated that in the Maori language on New Zealand there were two words which may possibly be of Sanskrit origin, whereas in 1852 this had risen to three words;<sup>5</sup> by 1856 he would claim that Maori contained no words of Indian origin,<sup>6</sup> while in 1866 he vouched for the authenticity of an “ancient Hindu sacrificial bell” found on New Zealand’s Northern Island!<sup>7</sup> And finally, he would in 1868 conclude that “we have negative evidence of the antiquity of the Malayan connection in the fact that, among the Malayan words which occur in the Polynesian, no vestiges is to be found of the Sanskrit element”.<sup>8</sup>

Another contested Polynesian issue on which Crawford oscillated was the question whether the Polynesians were the first to arrive at the Pacific isles, or did another race inhabit (some of) these islands before they arrived? Or, in other words, what kind of master narrative would most aptly describe the dynamics of the peopling of the Pacific: was it a classic *migration story* of the spread to

---

<sup>1</sup> Ascribed to the almost innate roving and enterprising spirit of the Malay seafarers – a spirit which allegedly was present from the very beginning, and as soon as the technological progress provided the opportunities, such large expeditions could/would have taken place. And some of these could easily have reached the Pacific given the prevailing winds and currents. This argument relied, to a large extent, upon diachronic analogies to the state of affair in contemporary Indian Archipelago where the huge fleets of ‘Illanun pirates’ infested the whole region during their expeditions which often lasted several years. (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.ccxlii-ccxlviii)

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.ccli.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1868c, pp.10-11 & 20.

<sup>4</sup> See Ballantyne 2004, as well as chapters 2 & 4 in Ballantyne 2002.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.350, and Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cxli. In both cases he referred to W. Williams’ “Dictionary of the New Zealand Language, and a Concise Grammar” (Pahia 1844) as his source of information.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1856, p.359 (under the entry ‘Polynesia’).

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1867b.

<sup>8</sup> Crawford 1868c, pp.18-19.

unpopulated, virgin soil, did an *extinction discourse*<sup>1</sup> fit the facts better, or would it be more appropriate to adopt the *displacement narrative* popularized by J.R. Forster?<sup>2</sup> The first option, the very notion that the whole of the Polynesian part of the Pacific had originally constituted an uninhabited ‘virgin soil’ seemed intuitively anathema to an inveterate polygenist like Crawford.<sup>3</sup> Yet, in 1852, based on negative linguistic evidence, Crawford discarded the probability, if not the possibility per se, of a previous population on the (later) Polynesian islands.<sup>4</sup> However, by 1868 racial evidence, furnished from the tiny and isolated Chatham Islands, seemed to intimate that this may not necessarily have been the case. After they had been decimated and brought on the verge of extinction by recent Maori invasions, the source of information upon whom Crawford relied<sup>5</sup> suggested that the puny (and intermixed) remnants of the native Moiori people exhibited physical features, not at least “darker skins” than the invading Maoris, and which “would seem to make them a race distinct from the Polynesian”;<sup>6</sup> these descriptions could then be invoked as providing evidence of a pre-Polynesian population of the Pacific Islands. This interpretation would support a narrative of extinction, probably posited within a larger displacement discourse. An aboriginal, pre-Polynesian population had thus been exterminated before being able to impute any traces in language or otherwise upon the invading (instead of merely migrating!) Polynesians. This had happened long ago all over the Pacific, save on the isolated Chatham Islands; here, the incitements for- as well as the dynamics of this a process of extermination could be observed in the present Maori invasions.

---

<sup>1</sup> I have borrowed this term from P. Brantlinger who specified this as a particular discursive formation, as “a specific branch of the dual ideologies of imperialism and racism”. Furthermore, it was characterised by “its uniformity across other ideological fault lines: whatever their disagreements, humanitarians, missionaries, scientists, government officials, explorers, colonists, soldiers, journalists, novelists, and poets were in basic agreement about the inevitable disappearance of some or all primitive races. This massive and rarely questioned consensus made extinction discourse extremely potent, working inexorably toward the very outcome it often opposed.” (Brantlinger 2003, pp.1-2) For more on this topic, see the many informed articles in *Moses*.

<sup>2</sup> By this I refer to the theories which accounted for the distribution of the ‘racial diversities’ within the Indo-Pacific region by assuming the existence of a black-skinned, autochthonous population in the region who had later been replaced in all the most fertile and salubrious parts by more civilized, lighter-skinned immigrants; in the Indian Archipelago they were condemned to live in the most remote and mountainous regions (apart from the Andaman Islands), whereas they also inhabited all of New Guinea and the adjacent islands that Dumont d’Urville later would denominate ‘Melanesia’. Before J.R. Forster, de Brosses was the first to apply this explanatory mode systematically to the Pacific region. (See esp. *Douglas & Ballard*, pp.102-106)

<sup>3</sup> Inferring analogically, Crawford late in life a priori assumed the existence of an aboriginal Pacific population on the grounds that “no such extensive portion of the earth’s surface as the one in question [the Pacific isles] has ever been found destitute of an aboriginal population.” (Crawford 1868c, pp.12-13)

<sup>4</sup> “we must either suppose that one island, or at most one group of islands only, was originally peopled; or that, *if other islands were so*, their first inhabitants *must have been exterminated* by the invading Polynesian race now occupying them; or that, *amalgamating with the conquerors*, their languages were wholly superseded by the language of the latter. Certain it is, at all events, that *no trace of any other people, or any other language, has been discovered in the islands occupied by the Polynesians.*” (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclii)

<sup>5</sup> Crawford here referred to W. Travers’s article “On the Destructions of the Aborigines of Chatham Islands”, brought in TES, Vol.4 (1866), pp.352-360, and which was based on Travers’s own voyage to these islands.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1868c, p.14. Yet they had “the same straight coarse hair as the Polynesians”; this, combined with their Roman or ‘Jew-like’ noses, seemed, however, to counter any hypothesis indicating a racial affiliation between these and the present inhabitants of New Guinea and the Melanesian Islands – the nearest neighbours!

The exceptional recourse taken by Crawford to a genealogical explanation could, as mentioned, be accounted for as a (forced) result of innovative methodological features in his linguistic analysis, as well as by the growth in the knowledge of these languages. A growth facilitated by the information provided- and the knowledge produced by the French, Russian, and American scientific expeditions traversing the Pacific during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C., and in particular by the intensified British, American, and French missionary activity. The more oscillating character of Crawford's discourse on the Pacific, however, revealed the relative unfamiliarity and the secondary nature of his knowledge of the region too.

### **3.4.4 Crawford's Analytical Tools: Orthography, Grammar & Lexicography.**

From at least 1848 and onwards, Crawford's linguistic researches operated explicitly with three analytical categories of phonetics, grammar, and lexicography. His article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* from 1834 seemed to inaugurate a more theoretical approach in Crawford's linguistic discourse, and this was followed in 1848 by a methodological stringency which reached its zenith in the "preliminary Dissertation" to the *Grammar and Dictionary* in 1852.

Crawford, like the rest of the Scottish orientalist, proved to be rather receptive towards the newest philological methods,<sup>1</sup> emanating from in particular from the German universities, once these reached the British Isles sometime after 1830.<sup>2</sup> Sometimes these became blended with older, more established traditions, as it was amply illustrated in Crawford's continued use of particles to demarcate different languages from one another. Both the *particles* and the *civilization indicating loanwords* obviously belonged to the lexicographical category, but Crawford also found a place for phonetics as well as grammar in his analysis. Crawford's linguistic analysis usually began with an assessment of the "phonetic character" of the language in question; this was often subsumed under the heading 'orthography' given that it also implied an attempt to establish a standardized way of writing these languages through the letters of the Latin alphabet. In the context of grammar and his enhanced focus on this, Crawford both in 1852 and in 1856 referred to how "a *supposed similarity of grammatical structure*" as a test of a genealogical affinity between two languages had been "chiefly relied on by late German writers". Undoubtedly he here had particularly W. von Humboldt in mind. This approach, however, Crawford maintained, "I am not disposed to attach much weight, when applied to languages of remarkably single structure, affording necessarily few salient points

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rendall*, p.58.

<sup>2</sup> Grimm's "Deutsche Grammatik" was reviewed in the *Foreign Review* in 1830; the reception of this review and the debates it spurred in Great Britain has been analysed in *Aarsleff 1966/1983*. (pp.162-210) See also *Beer*, pp.100-104, for a discussion of the impact of Hensleigh Wedgwood's review of Grimm's theories and methodological approaches published in the *Quarterly Review* in 1833.

of comparison”.<sup>1</sup> Yet, rather than discarding the applicability of this test of grammatical structure altogether, Crawford merely refuted its practical use as a test when the compared languages had a ‘simple’ grammatical structure, such as the one prevailing within the languages of insular Southeast Asia according to the general consensus then.<sup>2</sup>

The most innovating aspect of his *lexicographical approach* was composed of the frequent attempts at quantifying the amount and kind of shared lexicographical elements among the analysed languages; this was done in order to establish what type of linguistic relationship that might exist between these. D. Hymes has pointed to the French naval officer and explorer Dumont d’Urville as being the first who studied the Oceanic languages from an approach founded in the burgeoning discipline of *lexicostatistics*;<sup>3</sup> that is, in the words of R. Blench, “the counting of cognate words between two or more languages in a standardised list” with the purpose of devising “a method for calculating a coefficient of their relationship.”<sup>4</sup> Dumont d’Urville published his linguistic researches in 1834,<sup>5</sup> and, even though Crawford’s writings do not contain any direct references to this particular text, he had earlier professed his debt to the recent French circumnavigators, to the scientists who accompanied these expeditions, and to the metropolitan savants who processed their discoveries,<sup>6</sup> as instrumental in the framing of his general approach to the Oceanic region, its inhabitants, and their languages.<sup>7</sup> Crawford’s later discourses on the languages in the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific thus contained a more statistical orientation, and by 1852 it had fully matured into Crawford’s own specific brand of a ‘lexicostatistical’ method. Once more we see Crawford not as much as a perspicacious inventor as an acute emulator who was quick to appropriate new scientific trends and incorporate them into his own system. Yet, unlike in Dumont d’Urville’s approach, Crawford did not attempt to ascribe any numerical value to the relative

---

<sup>1</sup> Both of these quotations are from *Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, p.iv, and an almost verbatim repetition of them can be encountered in *Crawford 1856*, p.211 (Under the entry on ‘Language’).

<sup>2</sup> Max Müller thus inscribed these Southeast Asian languages into his category of Turanian languages, his residual category characterized by inorganic, non-inflexional primitivity – they were, in the words of Max Müller, *nomadic* languages, and the Malayan languages belonged to this category of languages (*Müller in Bunsen 1854*, Vol.III, pp.28-83, 339, & 403-49; see also *Driem*, pp.227-237) I will return to this issue in Part IV.

<sup>3</sup> See *Hymes*, pp.76-93.

<sup>4</sup> *Blench*, p.55.

<sup>5</sup> Hymes here referred to the 2<sup>nd</sup> volume on philology published in the series of books on the voyage of the *L’Astrolabe*, 1826-1829. This volume contained a comparison of the gathered vocabularies of the languages of Oceania (the first volume dealt with the Malagasy language). Dumont d’Urville had apparently planned a 3<sup>rd</sup> volume as well; this, however, was never published. (*Hymes*, pp.91-92) Crawford alluded briefly to Dumont d’Urville’s voyages in 1834 (*Crawford 1834*, p.372), but in linguistic context he did not appear to have quoted from him before 1852, and then only in one instance (*Crawford 1852a*, Vol.I, p.clxvii – referring to Gaimard’s vocabulary from the island of Gebe, near New Guinea).

<sup>6</sup> For more on these, see e.g. *Douglas & Ballard*, pp.3-155; *Staum*; and *Douglas 2010*, pp.196-210.

<sup>7</sup> See *Crawford 1834*, pp.372-373, as well as the frequent references to their published books in both *Crawford 1848a* and in *Crawford 1852a*.

resemblance between the terms “expressing the same meaning in two languages”,<sup>1</sup> let alone at calculating the relative affinity of these words – and, by assumed implication, also of the languages to which they belonged. Indeed, the latter fell altogether outside of Crawford’s theoretical scope, given that this particular mode of proceeding often was interpreted as implying a genealogical framework, supposing that the quantified linguistic diversity was a function of time and a result of migration followed by separation between groups originally speaking the same language.<sup>2</sup>

Crawford had already long before established himself as an accomplished statistician within several other fields.<sup>3</sup> In his address to the Royal Geographical Society in 1868, Sir R. Murchison grieved the demise of his old friend, John Crawford, whom he recognized as, amongst many other qualities, “an accurate statist”.<sup>4</sup> From the very onset this statistical inclination characterised Crawford’s discourses, particular those on trade and commerce,<sup>5</sup> and the chapters devoted to these topics in HIA were appraised for “involving very valuable statistic details”.<sup>6</sup> He was also a member of the Statistical Society of London and published in its journal.<sup>7</sup> Statistics, in short, permeated most of Crawford’s discourses; one of the more curious examples of this pursuit was undoubtedly his attempt to calculate a rough estimate of the total population of the kingdom of Ava derived from the information he had obtained on their consumption of petroleum that they used for their lamps!<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *Hymes*, p.83; Dumont d’Urville’s analysis was primarily orientated towards the lexical level. (p.70) According to Hymes, the more technical elements of Dumont d’Urville’s lexicostatistical analysis were not embraced or developed by any of his contemporaries, and the breakthrough of lexicostatistics did not come until more than 100 years later.

<sup>2</sup> Even though the texts published in the wake of Dumont d’Urville’s expeditions exhibited a tendency towards “a remarkable polygenetic interpretation of the physical anthropological data” (*Hymes*, p.93; see also *Staum*, esp. pp.40-48 & 144-149), Dumont d’Urville’s own philological treatises seemed to be unequivocally monogenetic and genealogical (*Hymes*, pp.70 & 93). Both the premise contained in the *Word list (basic vocabulary)* and the historical inferences drawn from the lexicostatistical analysis of these terms presupposed such a framework; this was despite the fact that such lexicographical approach and the tables produced by it in principle only demonstrated “a measure of lexical agreement *whatever source, genetic, diffusional, or other.*” (*Hymes* p.68; my italics)

<sup>3</sup> Here it should be remembered that then the term *statistics* was not necessarily associated with the same quantitative connotations as it is today: first borrowed from the German word *Statistik* in 1749 it chiefly related to information that could be employed in the service of governing the state and which may have been standardised to a certain extent. But it was not always quantified, let alone mathematically manipulated. See *Poovey* (esp. pp.307-317) for more on the debates on the definition, content, and use of statistics in the early 19<sup>th</sup> C. British context. Crawford’s friend and sometime collaborator, J.R. McCulloch played a prominent part in these debates. (on the Crawford-McCulloch ‘connection’, see *Quilty* 2001, pp.79-80 and p.167)

<sup>4</sup> *Murchison*, p.cxlvi.

<sup>5</sup> See *Crawford* 1817a.

<sup>6</sup> Review of HIA in the *British Review* (1820), p.345; in most other instances the anonymous author of this review was very sceptical of the merits of HIA! See also e.g. pp.122-123 in the review brought in the *Edinburgh Magazine* in 1820, and p.240 in the review brought in the *Eclectic Review* in 1821.

<sup>7</sup> Crawford appears to have published 3 articles in this journal throughout the 1840s and 1850s; see *Crawford* 1849, *Crawford* 1852c, and *Crawford* 1853c.

<sup>8</sup> *Crawford* 1829a, pp.55-57. As his premise Crawford stated that “if it were practicable, therefore, to ascertain the real quantity [of petroleum] produced at the wells, we should be possessed of the means of making a tolerable estimate of the inhabitants who make use of this commodity, constituting the larger part of the population of the kingdom.” The problem was to gain any just remotely reliable information on the “real quantity”; yet, after a series of considerations and calculations, Crawford arrived at the number of 2,066,721 consumers of petroleum in the kingdom! Despite the vast uncertainty associated with this calculation, Crawford maintained that “calculations formed from such crude materials,

However, Crawford's 'lexicostatistical' method did not bring much new to his linguistic researches; rather they only seemed to confirm his linguistic theories and the hypothesis he already held regarding the dissemination of language elements. Dividing the analysed words into different categories, Crawford claimed that the percentage of cognate words – indicating a common origin of these words and, if they were *radical* words, the language too – was generally rather low. Furthermore, the fact that the portion of Malay and Javanese words present in other languages were “found to diminish in amount as we recede, either by distance or other difficulty of communication”<sup>1</sup> seemed to confirm the hypothesis of a linguistic dissemination from the centre to the peripheries thorough travel, trade, conquest, and colonization – even though this quantified data of a receding similarity as a functions of the distance could also be interpreted as a result of separation in time and space, and hence perceived as corroborating the genealogical theory of an original unity followed by subsequent diversification! Yet, the decisive evidence in support of his own hypothesis was, according to Crawford, provided by the way in which this receding similarity as a function of the distance applied in particularly to terms (especially nouns but also some verbs) referring to *civilization indicating products or practices*, whereas the *language-demarcating types of words*, such as the particles, were characterized by generally not being cognate. Hence, rather than being fundamental to his argument, Crawford's use of lexicostatistics merely provided a rhetorical bolstering of his theoretical approach and of his hypothesis by garmenting it with a discourse vested with a significant scientific authority.

Generally the two former categories (*phonetics and grammar*) were used to corroborate inferences already made through evidence furnished by the lexicography; sometimes, however, the situation proved to be more complex and in need of further explanation, as the following example of the languages spoken in the Philippine Archipelago illustrates.

Partly because of their political affiliations and partly due to the geographical circumstances, Crawford a priori approached the Philippine languages as if they constituted an autonomous entity, in many aspects differing from the rest of the Indian Archipelago. It was thus hardly surprising when he detected a marked discrepancy between the languages spoken here and those dominating in the rest of the Indian Archipelago, viz. Malay and Javanese. Apart from the Malayan (or Javanese or Sanskrit, both disseminated through the Malay language) provenance of many of the terms which referred to concepts, tools, and institutions associated with the progress of civilization,

---

and which would be justly discarded where means of gaining more accurate information are within reach, have their value in a country in which exact details are never procurable upon any question of statistics.”

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxv.

its influence had otherwise been slight in the Philippines.<sup>1</sup> After analysing the phonetic character and the grammatical structure of the Philippine languages, Crawfurd stated that: “It does not, then, appear, from a comparison of the *phonetic character*, and *grammatical structure* of the Tagala [Tagalog], with those of Malay and Javanese, that there is any ground *for fancying them to be one and the same language, or languages sprung from a common parent*, and only diversified by the effects of time and distance. An examination of the *words* which are common to them brings us to the same result.”<sup>2</sup> At the end of the analysis he would repeat this in even more polemic terms; arguing analogically Crawfurd stated that:

“I conclude, then, by expressing my conviction, that as far as the evidence yielded by a comparison of the Tagala, Bisaya, and Pampanga languages with the Malay and Javanese goes, *there is no more ground for believing that the Philippine and Malayan languages have a common origin*, than for concluding that Spanish and Portuguese are Semitic languages, because they contain a few hundred words of Arabic, or that the Welsh and Irish are of Latin origin, because they contain a good many words of Latin; or that Italian is of Gothic origin, because it contains a far greater number of Teutonic origin than any Philippine language does of Malay and Javanese.”<sup>3</sup>

Yet, even if these analogies were considered to furnish a sufficient ground for inferring negatively that there existed no reason for assuming a genealogical affinity between Malay and Javanese on the one hand and the Philippine languages on the other, the problem still remained “whether the principal languages of the Philippines be separate and distinct tongues or mere dialects of a common language”, and this was seemingly “a question not easy to determine.”<sup>4</sup> Evidence adduced from the different analytical categories seemed to point in each their direction; the similar phonetics and shared grammar of the languages pointed to a common origin and thence a

<sup>1</sup> For Crawfurd’s examination of these terms and their introduction into the Philippine languages, see *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, pp.ccxxvii-ccxl.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxiv; my italics. Tagala (Tagalog) is the largest of the many languages spoken on the Philippine islands; Crawfurd’s conclusion did also extend to all the other languages of the Philippines. Regarding the lexicography, Crawfurd later (p.cxix) stated that “it may be concluded, then, that the Malay and Javanese particles, which often differ from each other, bear neither of them any more resemblance to those of the Tagala or Bisaya than they do to those [languages] of and African or American tongue.”

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxxix; my italics. Tagala, Bisaya, and Pampanga were by Crawfurd considered the most widely disseminated Philippine languages.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxxii. Leyden had, on the other hand, explicitly claimed that “it [Tagalog] is considered by those who have studied it with most attention, as the radical language, from which the greater part, if not all, the dialects of the Philippines are derived.” (*Leyden 1811*, p.207); and Marsden had stated that on the Philippine islands “several languages are commonly supposed to prevail (independently of such as are spoken by the *Negritos*); but the slightest examination will shew them to be very similar dialects of the same language, and to have all the characteristics of the Polynesian.” (*Marsden 1834*, p.41); W. von Humboldt had stated a similar opinion in the chapter on the Philippine languages in his “Über die Kawi Sprache” (*Humboldt 1838*, pp.315-320 [Vol.II, 3<sup>rd</sup> Book, 2<sup>nd</sup> Part, §16]) – this chapter thus began by asserting that: “Ich beginne hier mit der Tagalischen [Tagalog/Tagala], da sie insofern für die *primitive und den Ursprung* der übrigen [languages of the Philippines] angesehen kann” (p.315), and he ended by concluding that “das Tagalische verhält sich zu ihnen [the other Philippine languages], wie das Sanskrit zu den aus ihm abstammenden alten und neuen Sprachen.” (p.319)

genealogical relationship,<sup>1</sup> whereas evidence adduced from lexicographical data, and in particular from the particles, appeared to contradict this.<sup>2</sup> Hence, the kind of relationship existing between these Philippine languages evaded any simple scheme according to which an analysis of each of the three categories ought to lead to the same conclusion. What was needed appeared to be a specific historical explanation that went beyond the templates offered by either a genealogical framework, or by Crawford's usual mode of explaining linguistic similarities as chiefly a result of a parallel dissemination of civilization and language since this failed to account for the close similarity, or indeed identity, of the phonetic character and grammatical structure between these languages. Abiding by the general tendency within his theoretical approach – and thus *ascribing a methodological primacy to role of lexicography, and in particular to the particles*, when defining the extension of a given language and determining its genealogical affinities – Crawford interpreted the available linguistic data as providing negative evidence in favour of a non-genealogical relationship between the various languages spoken on the Philippine islands, despite the profoundly entangled nature of their grammatical structures and the identity of their phonetic character. Instead of providing an explanative potential, as usually assumed within the contemporary linguistic theories, the identity in grammatical structure and phonetic character thus here became a problem in need of explanation; when compared to most of the contemporary linguistic theories, Crawford's theoretical approach implied, so to speak, a reversal of the *burden of explanation* with regard to the existing linguistic structures in the Philippines. As a combined result of 1) the inferences that followed from the theoretical importance ascribed to the particles by Crawford, and of 2) his grander framework of linguistic polygenism which marginalised the genealogical mode of explanation, such identities were discursively presented as a deviance from the norm rather than an expected confirmation of the rule. Diversity, not identity, ruled – unless anything else had been stated explicitly. As such, Crawford's linguistic discourse was, in the words of H. White, “both interpretive and preinterpretive”; they were as much about the nature of the interpretation itself as about the subject matter which gave occasion to its own elaboration.<sup>3</sup>

On the basis of these considerations, and with his usual allusions to allegedly analogical examples from other parts of the world, Crawford in the end argued that:

“Notwithstanding the difficulty of accounting for the similarity of phonetic character and grammatical principle among the Philippine languages, not greater, however, than among

---

<sup>1</sup> “Judging, then, by the identity of the *phonetic* character of the Bisaya and Tagala, and the parallel which runs through their whole *grammatical structure*, we might be disposed to come, at once to *the conclusion, that they are mere dialects of a common tongue.*” (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cxxiii; my italics)

<sup>2</sup> “This is, however, opposed by the stubborn fact that the great majority of their nouns, adjectives, and especially particles are wholly different.” (Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cxxiii)

<sup>3</sup> White 1978, p.4.



the western languages of the Archipelago, and generally among those of Africa and America, and also among the group of Hindu languages, *I am disposed, on the strong evidence of glossarial difference, to consider the languages of the Philippines, not as mere dialects of a common language, but as distinct and independent tongues.*"<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, he appealed to what he perceived as "ample *internal evidence* of much intercourse among the more advanced nations, and this was naturally to be looked for, in countries pressed close together, and parted only by narrow seas, as early as navigation had made any tolerable advance."<sup>2</sup> Upon this rationale he then offered the following explanation in the form of a conjectured reconstruction of the manner in which such intercourse between these more advanced nations may have caused the profound linguistic similarities *without* these being an outcome of a shared origin and a genealogical affinity:

"In the course of this intercourse, the less advanced tribes may have borrowed the grammatical forms of their languages, as unquestionably they did in their writing,<sup>3</sup> from one more advanced nation. Very probably the centrally situated Tagala was that nation. That the grammatical structure originated with one nation is at all events certain, from the identity of the particles used in forming nouns and pronouns; from the identity and peculiarity of the pronouns – from there being but one set of these for all the languages, and from the identity

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxxvii; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cxxvii. The italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> That is, an argumentative recourse to an allegedly *analogical instance* that furthermore formed part of the same process; it remains, however, moot whether these two aspects could be deemed sufficiently overlapping to legitimate the validity of such an analogical argument! In concordance with his general approach and with his earlier writings on the different alphabets existent in insular Southeast Asia, Crawfurd here preferred once again to ascribe these an autochthonous origin rather than perceiving them as a product of the diffusion of Indian civilization through Sanskrit influence, and which had brought alphabetical writing in its wake too (although he did admit that the alphabets of the Indian subcontinent later had exerted a profound influence upon the various alphabets allegedly already used in Southeast Asia). He here rather cavalierly dismissed the theories held by the "Spanish writers on the topic as the mere opinion of people who really knew nothing of the matter; instead he asserted that "the Tagala alphabet, then, has all the appearance of an *original and local invention*; and, at all events, there is assuredly *no evidence* to show that it has been derived from a foreign source." (*Crawfurd 1852a*, Vol.I, p.cvii; my italics) Marsden had earlier uttered a similar contempt for manner in which the Spanish missionary-grammarians had treated the subject of the Philippine alphabets, and hence he had, too, cursorily rejected any validity of their writings on this topic (*Marsden 1834*, pp.42-43). The interesting point in Crawfurd's assertion, however, is that Crawfurd's argument apparently placed the *burden of proof* to rest solely upon those who advocated a diffusionist explanation; hence, any absence of positive evidence in favour of this hypothesis would automatically bolster the credibility of the autochthonous hypothesis! Such an approach would hardly make much sense outside of a staunchly polygenetic framework, and it also appeared somewhat at odds with the emphasis on the dissemination of civilization that otherwise permeated Crawfurd's discourses on language. Only if alphabets were considered to have originated at a very early stage of civilization, and that they proved to be quite resistant to foreign influence, could this stance be upheld within the large theoretical stress on the influence of the dissemination of civilization. For more on Crawfurd's reflections and theories on the various alphabets in insular Southeast Asia, see e.g. *HIA*, Vol.II, pp.74-78; *Crawfurd 1834*, pp.407-412 (where he referred to A.-Y. Goguet's theories on the genesis of alphabets [in "L'origine des Loix", 1758]; for more on these theories, see *Pocock 2005*, pp.37-64); and the article Crawfurd dedicated to this topic in 1850 (*Crawfurd 1850*). For some of his discussions of this after 1852, see, among others, especially *Crawfurd 1856*, pp.409-411 (under the entry on 'Language'; there is no separate entry on 'Alphabet'); *Crawfurd 1867a*, pp.99 & 100-102; and finally in *Crawfurd 1869*. For a history on this topic, see *Hudson 1994*, of which esp. ch. 5-7 are relevant here, and *Hock & Joseph*, pp.65-109 for a more general treatment.

of the inseparable particles used in the formation of the verb, and which, when taken by themselves, have no independent meaning.”<sup>1</sup>

So, even when faced with such glaring linguistic similarities, Crawford dismissed the possibility of a genealogical explanation, even though he this time actually deemed it necessary to provide an alternative explanation, instead of just flatly denying its validity. Instead he opted for what appeared to be a particular historical explanation especially made to cover this unique pattern of events; this seemed somewhat at odds with the prevailing nomothetic inclinations in his discourse. Yet, it did account for the linguistic phenomena, and it furthermore complied with what he in HIA had described as the third layer of linguistic interaction in the Indian Archipelago, viz. that of “the language of the tribe or tribes in the immediate neighbourhood”. In a certain way it even offered a template of what we, in the absence of any terminology of his own, might denominate Crawford’s cluster theory of languages.

This *cluster theory of languages* functionally replaced the genealogical explanation when geographically linked languages exhibited linguistic similarities that went far beyond merely sharing a terminology indicative of civilizational progress. Although it did not reach its refined form until the 1850s, Crawford had already intimated a sketch of it in his article from 1834: “upon the whole, then, our conclusion is, that each Oceanic<sup>2</sup> language is of a separate and distinct origin, – and that the people by whom they were spoken communicated words to each other exactly in proportion to the closeness of neighbourhood, or extent of intercourse between them, the ruder and weaker tribes commonly borrowing from the most improved and powerful. On this principle, the different languages may be divided into several classes or groups”.<sup>3</sup> These classes, or clusters, were spatially well defined and narrowly demarcated. Within the confines of these geographically bounded clusters the “communicated words” could also occasionally include particles and other *radical words* in Crawford’s sense, even though the exchange of civilization indicating terms obviously comprised the vast majority.<sup>4</sup>

Discarding the genealogical model of a common origin of all the languages spoken by the ‘brown-complexioned’ races throughout the region (with the exception of the specific case of the Polynesian part of the Pacific), Crawford by the 1850s thought “it impossible to avoid coming to the conclusion that they are distinct and independent tongues.”<sup>5</sup> However, he did detect “what may

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> As we will remember from Part II, chapter 1, this was the term he used in 1834 to denominate the entire insular region stretching from Easter Island to Madagascar, together with its inhabitants and the languages they spoke.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1834, p.399.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1834, p.395.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxv.

be termed *provincial differences* arising chiefly from pronunciation”, but at the same time he rejected that these represented *dialectical* variations in the usual meaning of the term.<sup>1</sup> Instead, he inferred that “the languages of the Archipelago might indeed be *classed in groups, according to their phonetic character and grammatical structure*, but this would, by no means, make even all the languages of one group, the same tongue, as long as their elementary words and the body of each language are known to be different.”<sup>2</sup> In the “Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries” Crawford identified on these grounds 3 larger clusters within the Indian Archipelago itself, and 5 if Polynesia and Madagascar were included; these were composed of the Western Indian Archipelago, the Eastern Indian Archipelago, and the Philippine islands.<sup>3</sup> Instead of considering these clusters as being composed of genealogically affiliated languages, they were rather perceived as classificatory units that relied on *structural resemblances* without necessarily sharing the same origin.

It was not a common origin, but a shared history of continuous interaction and, civilizationally as well as linguistically layered, entanglements that linked them together; the historical processes of amalgamation that had led to these structural resemblances could then be decoded in the particular linguistic features that each region and its language cluster possessed.

### **3.5 A Final Reflection: Crawford and Some Recent Objections.**

Recently, the primacy of the genealogical theories as providing the most adequate framework for interpretations in the intersections between historical philology and archaeology has been challenged by more network-orientated approaches. Both the Indo-European and the Austronesian hypotheses<sup>4</sup> have thus been scrutinized, and in particular their concept of *culture* has become an object of severe criticism. Through their focus on interaction and hybridity, rather than on original nature and unchanging essence, these new approaches share some similarities with Crawford’s linguistic studies; both represent an alternative approach to the one offered by the more ‘orthodox’ theory with its emphasis on genealogy and diffusion explained through migrations.

Acknowledging the dangers of anachronism inherent in all kinds of diachronic comparison my purpose is here limited to an examination of how these modern approaches can be used to provide us with some new perspectives on: 1) the aspects of continuity involved in these theoretical queries that, in some manner, seem to defy time and space; and 2) those elements which were characteristic of the specific intellectual environment and unique socio-politico contexts, and which can be

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, pp.cclxxxv-cclxxxvi; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1852a, Vol.I, p.cclxxxvi; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1856, pp.207-208. In the entry on ‘Language’.

<sup>4</sup> Like, for instance, in C. Renfrew’s “Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins” (1987) in the former case, and Bellwood’s theories in the latter (see e.g. *Bellwood, Fox, and Tryon*)

defined by the “physical location, social positioning, and cognitive authority”<sup>1</sup> of those who participated in these knowledge producing processes.<sup>2</sup>

Klaus Ebbesen is one of those who recently have questioned the conceptual foundation of the Indo-European hypothesis, with its accompanying notions of a prehistoric migration/invasion from a central Asian Urheim into Europe of a people<sup>3</sup> who spoke a proto-Indo-European language and carried with them a specific material and spiritual culture. Assuming as a premise the generally accepted idea that language is socially constructed, and hence “it can only be analysed in a social context”,<sup>4</sup> Ebbesen criticised the linguists’ use of a static and essentialist notion of *culture* which has been abandoned in most other scholarly disciplines.<sup>5</sup> Inspired by newer theories in the field of archaeology Ebbesen instead advocated an approach focussing on parallel patterns of developments of prehistoric communities; these were mainly explained by a continuous exchange and interaction of both material and cultural artefacts on an aggregated Euroasian level, instead of being the result of large scale migrations. This not only implied the abandonment of a fixed concept of culture and a downplaying of the significance of the idea of large scale migrations;<sup>6</sup> it also had as a consequence that the very notions of *Ursprache*, original location, and a genealogical dynamics of language became of secondary importance to the role played by “the highly effective communication system that existed in prehistoric Europe”,<sup>7</sup> and which has been amply testified in archaeological findings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Livingstone 2003, p.182.

<sup>2</sup> Although I entirely agree with D.N. Livingstone when he emphasised that “rationality is always *situated* rationality. And it is always embodied rationality”, and hence that “scientific rationality cannot be conceived of independently of temporal and spatial location” (Livingstone 2003, p.184), the spatio-temporally defined nexuses of knowledge production examined here nonetheless also involved a set of problems and theories that had been continually addressed throughout European intellectual history. They compose the *longue durée* dimension out of which the scholarly disciplines gradually grew and became reified through the disciplining of the methodological approaches and theoretical interpretations. These, as stressed by T.R. Trautmann, played a crucial part in the conceptualization and formulation of the European gaze on India and their perceptions of its past, despite tendencies to downplay their influence in much modern historiography which solely focuses on the colonial context and the practical exigencies this situation generated. (see e.g. Trautmann 2009a, in particular pp.93-98 & pp.155-158)

<sup>3</sup> For more on *ethnicity* as an object of research and as an analytical tool in archaeological studies, see Jones 1997.

<sup>4</sup> Ebbesen, p.35.

<sup>5</sup> Ebbesen, pp.36-38. Ebbesen stressed that until quite recently there existed no fixed and firmly founded linguistic demarcation lines corresponding to the borders that exist on a map showing the territories of the different countries; neither language nor culture were clearly demarcated, autonomous entities, but existed within a spatial continuum where both culture and language intermixed and changed gradually. (On this topic, see ch.4 in Burke 2004)

<sup>6</sup> Ebbesen, p.59. See McConvell for a recent attempt to form a more sophisticated theory that integrated both large scale migrations and the notion of multidirectional cultural flows in the procurement and interpretation of linguistic, archaeological, and genetic evidence. “The beginning of success in distinguishing between evidence for migration and for cultural diffusion links to the notion supported in this chapter that we need to develop robust characterisations of ‘signatures’ – characteristic patterns – of migration and of cultural diffusion in the interdisciplinary field of archaeology, linguistics, and bio-genetics.” (p.158) In the end, however, McConvell privileged migration as “the most important driving force in spreading languages and cultures in all areas, among hunter-gatherers as well as among farmers and pastoralists.” (p.186)

<sup>7</sup> Ebbesen, pp.60-61.

In “Leaves of the Same Tree: Trade and Ethnicity in the Straits of Melaka” Leonard Y. Andaya treated ethnicity as a social construct, as a product of ongoing and ever changing material and cultural processes, just as much as a well defined category referring to “a way of conceptualizing the world and acting in it by privileging group identity and interests.”<sup>1</sup> It is both created and it creates –it explains and needs to be explained as well. This protean nature invariable eluded all attempts at non-situational fixation and exhaustive definition. Andaya’s central argument in this book was that in the Southeast Asian melting pot “ethnic formation is an ongoing process, with trade being the principal stimulus for change”; this rendered it “necessary to rethink [our] views of ‘ethnic’ politics in history.”<sup>2</sup> And in prehistory as well we might add. Indeed, Andaya himself invoked this argument in his discussion of the origin and spread of the Malay language, the continuous and most important aspect of Malay ethnicity. Appropriating W. Solheim’s theory of a network of Austronesian *Nusantao* communities, Andaya questioned the validity of the consensually acknowledged *Bellwood-Blust synthesis*; according to this the Austronesian languages (incl. proto-Malayo-Polynesian) originated on present day Taiwan, and through subsequent migrations they were diffused to finally encompassing the vast insular space between Madagascar and Easter Island, binding the entire region together through a set of genealogically linked Malayo-Polynesian languages. In contrast to this framework involving a location of origin, waves of migration, and a genealogical relationship between the languages, Andaya’s approach, like Ebbesen’s, operated with a “notion of interacting communities moving in multiple directions”.<sup>3</sup> Malay, as well as its linguistic predecessors, all originated and developed as practical lingua franca facilitating the trade in centre-less, maritime networks; hence “the expansion of Malayo-Polynesian was not the result of migrations but of the interaction occurring within the network.” Thus, according to Andaya, “the appeal of this model is the idea that the *spread of culture, including a lingua franca, evolved as a by-product of the trade and communications network* of a large number of different communities in a widely dispersed area.” The wider implications of this were that Malay language and its predecessors, which flourished during the *Nusantao* culture, should *not be seen as “associated with a single ethnic group, but with a style of life and a trade language* comprehensible throughout an interactive region.”

Ebbesen and Andaya both refuted to view prehistory primarily in terms of origin and diffusion of essentialized ethnic entities, whose extension were defined by linguistic demarcations and who were each deemed to possess a specific culture. Instead, they stressed the importance of trading networks and multidirectional interaction in the dynamism involving the uses of language,

---

<sup>1</sup> Andaya 2008, p.6.

<sup>2</sup> Andaya 2008, p.17.

<sup>3</sup> This, as well as the following, quotations are taken from Andaya 2008, pp.19-22; the italics are all mine.

exchanges of culture, and framing of ethnic identities. Language was assessed as a process rather than as an entity, and it was perceived as layered, composite, and contextual.

The common denominator between the two examples described above and Crawford's linguistic studies was that they all defined themselves in opposition to theories that emphasize a genealogical framework as constituting the most apt philological and anthropological approach. But apart from that, the question is whether they share any other similarities, and whether these recent theories can provide a new perspective upon Crawford's approach and results?

A closer examination confirms that the differences were at least as numerous as the similarities, and, furthermore, they seem to be of a profounder character than the somewhat superficial similarities that appear at first sight. Andaya's and Ebbesen's network-orientated theories operate with a non-centric notion of cultural interaction – emphasising the entangled function of language, culture, politics, and economy in the shaping of social and ethnic identity; in addition they stress the multidirectionality of the flows of the trade- and exchange based networks through which the communities in question were interlinked. Crawford's version of civilizational interaction, on the other hand, undoubtedly evinced unequivocally unidirectional traits; the routes of influence first and foremost emanated from the civilized centres (which usually coincided with the strongholds of power too) towards the remoter recesses, and hence it was also primarily a top-down mode of influence. The layered structure of civilization which Crawford decoded in each language – and which reflected the successive waves civilizational dissemination that had flooded all of these societies – could spatially be perceived as a series of overlapping concentric circles of different sizes, indicating various realms of civilizational influence. Each society possessed its own language which had, in terms of civilization, been deeply influenced by its closest neighbours and in particular by the most advanced society in the region; as such these composed geographically connected clusters of societies linked by civilizational, cultural, and linguistic bonds (albeit they should not necessarily be considered 'kindred' in the strictest sense of this term!). These, in turn, all belonged to the realm of Malayan and Javanese<sup>1</sup> civilization, the influence of which diminished with the distance from the centre, or, subsidiary, with other obstacles that impeded the links of communication. These, again, could be perceived as pertaining to the utter periphery of a Sanskrit civilization; the material and linguistic vestiges of this could be encountered in particular on Java, the most advanced location in the region – and the probable locus of its own civilization.

In contrast to this unidirectional model, with its strong emphasis on the core and a corresponding depreciation of the importance of the periphery, Andaya's approach instead focussed on how "over

---

<sup>1</sup> Or *Great Polynesian* in HIA.

time, continuing interactions forged cultural commonalities that could be identified with the entire network.”<sup>1</sup> A similar discrepancy can be found with regard to an assessment of the importance of the different modes of influence and media of interaction. Whereas Andaya concluded that “international trade was the glue that bound the widely dispersed communities together”<sup>2</sup>, Crawford, in due concordance with the *Zeitgeist* of an assertive liberal imperialism, accorded colonization and conquest almost as much importance as the more peaceful trade and travel. As such Crawford’s and Andaya’s discourses seem to be representative of the hegemonic historiographical paradigms of their own times; they personify the fundamental discrepancies between the composition of a universal, or world, history when viewed from the ideological vantage point of a 19<sup>th</sup> C. triumphalist liberal imperialism,<sup>3</sup> or when seen through the conceptual lenses provided by early 21<sup>st</sup> C. notions of a network- structured global history.

These discrepancies became even more enounced in the framing of the historical *actors* and *entities*. Here, Crawford’s theories unquestionably remained confined to the ideas and approaches associated with the *fixist paradigm* of both racial and, to a large extent, cultural categories. Hence, as we will see in the next part, Crawford, like all his contemporaries, perceived *Malayness* as an essentialist category;<sup>4</sup> it constituted a continuous ethnic entity which maintained its fundamental nature over time. Consequently much intellectual energy was vested in locating the seat of origin of the Malay nation, race, or civilization in order to understand its *original* nature, and then in tracing its routes and means of dissemination. In his tracing of the shifting and multiple meanings of the term *Malayu* (or merely *Malay*) Andaya, on the other hand, did his best to de-essentialise the term: although he referred to how the term Malay “has been used at various times to refer to a language, a culture, a regional group, a polity, and a local community”,<sup>5</sup> his main argument was nonetheless that it “was not simply an ethnonym but an all-encompassing term to define and affirm a family of communities” – a network of communities linked by intimate trade connections and cultural exchange which in time “developed a common cultural idiom”,<sup>6</sup> viz. the *Malayu*. Where *fixedness* was the key element in the approach cultivated by Crawford and his contemporaries (incl. those who primarily operated with a genealogical and diffusionist framework), *plasticity* seemed to characterise Andaya’s idea of culture and ethnicity; the ethnic entities as well as the cultural

---

<sup>1</sup> Andaya 2008, p.48.

<sup>2</sup> Andaya 2008, p.48.

<sup>3</sup> See pp.206-262 in *Koditschek* for a recent study of the treatment of the “lesser breeds” and the more primitive times within the liberal imperial historiography of this period. *Lorimer* dealt with a kindred topic but focussing on a later period, whereas *Jones 2007* analysed the opinions on these topics held by another ‘radical’, Karl Marx.

<sup>4</sup> However, already Marsden had noted that *Malayness* could also constitute a subjective, fluid, and inclusive category. In his time (and later) one automatically became Malay merely by professing the Muslim faith, abiding by some of its most fundamental tenets, and to a certain extent adopting the Malay language. (*Marsden 1811*, p.41-43. For modern discussions of this aspect, see e.g. *Milner*, ch.1-2, and *Andaya 2008*, p.11.

<sup>5</sup> Andaya 2008, p.14.

<sup>6</sup> Both this and the former quote are taken from *Andaya 2008*, p.48.

categories upon which these define themselves (and others) were continuously reformulated in a dialectical opposition to- and negotiation with those attributed to its neighbouring communities.

They also differed in their conceptualizations of language and in the ascription of its heuristic value in the context of historical and anthropological issues. In Crawford's approach the function of language merely reflected rather than constructed ethnic identity; his texts evinced no indications of an *expressive* or a *constructivist* conception of language.<sup>1</sup> On the contrary; on this point he appeared throughout the entire period to have been grounded firmly in an Enlightenment paradigm, professing a *representational* approach to language. The Promethean powers of language in the moulding and constant reshaping of ethnic identities and cultural formations, on the other hand, constituted a fundamental aspect in Andaya's theoretical approach; culture, language, and ethnicity were intricately intertwined as, simultaneously, being both the cause and effect of each other.<sup>2</sup>

So, Crawford as well as Ebbesen and Andaya, shared an awareness of the entangled nature of- and the dynamic processes involved in the development and dissemination of civilization. In each their way their analytical focus was directed on the polyglot manners in which the universal aspects of civilization interacted with the more particular features of national, or ethnic, cultures in the manifestation of the unique historical trajectories. However, as we have already seen, they differed fundamentally when it came to 1) defining the nature and scope of the historical entities referred to by their ethnic, national, or civilizational appellations, 2) discerning the ways in which these intricately intertwined entities interacted, and 3) explaining the general dynamics of these processes.

---

<sup>1</sup> The former term is borrowed from C. Taylor and relates to how "words were thought to reveal more about the subjective character and spirit of the speakers than about the objects they represented"; the latter term is here used in the meaning that Lia Formigari ascribed to it – where language "actively contribute to the way human subjects experience the world, engage in intersubjective relationships, and conceive of their own identities and cultural practices." Both these meanings are here taken from *Benes 2008*, p.20.

<sup>2</sup> On the role of language in Andaya's theoretical approach, see *Andaya 2008*, pp.10-11.



## **Part IV. From Language to Biology.**

### **Race, Nation, and Civilization as Demarcation Criteria, Descriptive Units and Historical Factors, 1810-1869.**

“Of their origin *the only reliable testimony we can produce is the evidence afforded by the examination of language*, for of any record of their past history the people themselves are as destitute, as are bees or beavers of the transactions of their predecessors.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1869a*, p.133; my italics.



## Discursive Moments in the Debates on the Indian Archipelago.

This Part abandons the thematically structured survey of the former in favour of a diachronic perspective; it aims at examining the ongoing debates dealing with the origin, dissemination, and subsequent interactions between the races, nations, and civilizations in Southeast Asia and adjacent regions. Thus, I here concentrate on identifying the main points of contention in the British *key texts*<sup>1</sup> written on this, and at analysing the major changes in the approaches to- and assessments of these topics in the period from approximately 1810 to the 1860s; I attempt to do this without, however, ignoring the aspects of continuity which also permeated these discourses in terms of their repeated insistence on a set of recurring themes, assumed to epitomize the historical essence and dynamics of the region. So, although time saw changes in the hypotheses advanced on these topics alongside with the theories these relied on, the interpretive grids remained rather intact – just like the privileging of language as the primary purveyor of evidence on the earliest history did. These furnished the frameworks in which the forms of *origin* and modes of *diffusion* of peoples, nations, culture, and civilization were articulated.

My focus will be directed at a set of decisive *discursive moments*<sup>2</sup>, marked by the publications of the abovementioned key texts and the ensuing discussions that these spurred. This includes an identification of the major interpretive disjunctions contained in these debates, together with a charting of their colonial and intellectual contexts. Special attention will be paid to: 1) the referential framework that – apart from structuring the field of contention and delineating its ‘rules of engagement’<sup>3</sup> – were also constantly contested and repeatedly reshaped by the arguments

---

<sup>1</sup> With *key texts* I refer to the a set of publications – including dictionaries, grammars, general histories, and specialised articles – which proved to be *foundational* in the sense that they set the standard on how adequately to approach and assess the history and ethnology of Southeast Asia through the conceptual lenses provided by the notions of race, nation, and civilization; furthermore, they stipulated the authoritative standards determining how one should procure evidence through the study of language. Thus, my main concern is on how these texts were received within their contemporary context rather than on the value they were retrospectively ascribed in the prevailing historiographical traditions. Hence, some texts which today are considered obscure, even within their own specialised branches of knowledge, are, nevertheless, here considered as *key texts*. These texts can thus be regarded as *constitutive* rather than merely reflective of the British approaches to this region and its historical essence.

<sup>2</sup> With this term I again want to stress the attention paid to the contemporary dimension of this analysis, and hence implying a relative downplaying of the importance of any retrospectively imposed authoritative canon. The term *moment* is here used to emphasize the aspect of temporality in the analysis: to stress that my focus is on the meanings extracted from- and importance attributed to these texts at a specific historical moment. Or, to paraphrase what has been written on *moment* as an analytical tool in another historical context – it refers to texts that were conceived as *epochal* (in the sense of establishing new ways of approaching and interpreting the topic in question), however ephemeral they may seem to the retrospective reader. (I have here, with the relevant emendations, paraphrased what Conrad and Sachsenmaier wrote on the meaning of *global moments* in *Conrad & Sachsenmaier*, p.13) The *discursive* part alludes to the ineluctable interconnection between the textual and the socio-political: to how the former imputed meaning to the latter and provided it with its epistemic and ideological frameworks, whereas the former could only attain its meanings when being produced and read *within* the matrix of an always already given, specific spatio-temporal location, characterised by its particular socio-political configurations. (See *Livingstone 2011*)

<sup>3</sup> Which influenced, among other things: (1) the positioning of the prefiguring burden of explanation, (2) the actual placing of the burden of proof, and (3) the assumed valid and authoritative modes of analogical reasoning.

invoked in the actual debates;<sup>1</sup> and to 2) the conceptual taxonomies through which they were articulated and which vested the arguments with their ascribed authority.

Apart from the abovementioned key texts, the analysis will also involve a wide variety of contemporary periodicals: both scholarly journals containing specialized articles on these topics as well as popular periodicals with articles of a more general character which, however, still dealt with these topics, albeit often in a broader and synthetic manner. Given the broader readership of the latter category these popular periodicals introduced this area and its historical themes to wider circles of society; these included, among many others, important scholars in other fields,<sup>2</sup> poets,<sup>3</sup> and politicians.

I will pay special attention to the reception of these texts within the major scholarly communities in both the metropolis and the colonial periphery, bearing in mind that these – at least in the British context – most often consisted of, and certainly influenced, the decision-making circles of politicians and (scholar)administrators.<sup>4</sup>

In order to keep the length of this Part within reasonable limits I will in the following target only two of the many interrelated questions that were debated at that time; one of these was considered to be of central importance to the discussions, whereas the other apparently had a more peripheral role. The first concerns the crucial question regarding the origin and essence of Malayness: this

---

<sup>1</sup> Even though this often only happened implicitly, rather than it was uttered in any direct way.

<sup>2</sup> D. Amigoni has argued that Darwin's use of information obtained during Crawford's diplomatic mission to Ava, 1826-1827, was derived from the reading of an article in the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal* rather than from the travelogue Crawford published in 1829. (Amigoni, pp.3-9) M. Demata has recently examined the "extraordinary number of articles" dealing with travels and travel literature in the *Edinburgh Review* during the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> C.. As well as discussing the work of leading scholars, these articles also furnished the readers with a digested version of the data that the travel literature provided to the scholars among the readers; furthermore, taking their point of departure in travel literature they also "provided the *Edinburgh* reviewers with the opportunity of discussing foreign policy issues". (Demata, p.83) A similar pattern appeared to characterize the other important contemporary periodicals: John Murray's competing *Quarterly Review* thus became the preferred venue in which Sir John Barrow, Marsden's successor as the 2<sup>nd</sup> Secretary at the Admiralty (see *Marsden 1838*, pp.110 & 129), would pursue his political agendas and exploration schemes in the disguise of merely being disinterested reviews of travel literature and other books on non-European topics (See also Part III, 3.5.2) (*Fleming*, pp.7-12 and *Lloyd*, pp.166-186; for a general treatment of the *Quarterly Review*, see also ch.3 of *Schoenfield*, and *Topham*, esp. pp.318-321)

<sup>3</sup> As e.g. S.T. Coleridge whose references- and relations to Crawford have been discussed in Part I. See Amigoni, pp.40-42 on how Coleridge deliberately attempted to preserve his discourse for a more selected and arcane readership through and eliding the "plebification of knowledge concerning science" associated with the other periodicals.

<sup>4</sup> Such influence could either be direct, or of a more indirect kind in form of patronage, shared membership of learned societies, or the like. See e.g. *Ballantyne 2001* and *Ballantyne 2002* (esp. chapters 1-2). See *Lester 2006* for a general discussion- and *Lester 2001* for a specific analysis of what can be obtained by applying a network orientated approach to these issues. Within the more particular context of science and knowledge production this line has been continued in *Gascoigne 2011*. As a case study of the influence of such societies where scholars, imperialists, philanthropists, and politicians mingled and exchanged views, J. Heartfield has recently mapped the impact of the Aborigines' Protection Society (APS) upon the politics and administration in the colonies. With regard to the fundamental and *constitutive* influence of historical writings – and in particularly those of the conjectural historians and their successors, the 'liberal imperialists' – I fully concur with T. Koditschek's assessment, that "history was invoked, not merely to justify imperialism, but *actively* to *reconstruct* it along novel lines. Roadmaps for the future could be derived from history's inherently reflexive character – its incessant dialectic between a projective future and an interpretable past." (Quoted from *Supplementary Notes to Introduction (Koditschek 2011b)*; see also *Pitts 2005* and *Sartori 2006*.

question was deemed absolutely quintessential in the delineation of the history of the region, notwithstanding whether ‘Malay’ primarily referred to nation, race, civilization, or language.

As an example of the latter I examine the ways in which the westernmost part of this vast insular region, viz. Madagascar, was integrated into the historical and ethnological narrative that bound it together. Always perceived as constituting the uttermost rim of the region, an accounting for the presence of Madagascar’s black, yet Austronesian speaking, inhabitants seemed to defy any simple explanation. Apparently first mentioned by H. Reland in the early 18<sup>th</sup> C.,<sup>1</sup> Marsden saw “the indisputable existence” of this linguistic connection as “one of the most extraordinary facts in the history of language.”<sup>2</sup> Firstly, a vast stretch of ocean separated this big island from the rest of the archipelago, and, unlike the route to the Pacific, the Indian Ocean was almost devoid of islands; this seemed to rule out any possibility of *island hopping*.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, this presence of a society speaking a language clearly affiliated to those of the Indian Archipelago but whose inhabitants, nevertheless, possessed a physiognomy much more akin to the people belonging to the neighbouring African continent constituted an unsettling factor; they presented an apparent conundrum, posing an even bigger explanatory challenge than the one posed by the shared linguistic traits between the yellow-complexioned inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago<sup>4</sup> and the tall, fairer-skinned Polynesians. The question regarding the possible means and methods of transportation between the Indian Archipelago and Madagascar has already been discussed in Part II, chapters 1 and 2; of more importance to my agenda here are the different, and discrepant, explanatory modes that were invoked not only to account for this spatially distant relationship but also to conceptually bridge the otherwise glaring gap between language and biology in the shape of the Austronesian (or Malayo-Polynesian) speaking, black Malagasies. This problem was more than merely skin deep; on the contrary, it touched upon the very essence of the supposed non-contingent linkages between race

---

<sup>1</sup> For Reland’s interpretation of the languages of Madagascar as being affiliated with Malay, Javanese, and other languages of the Indian Archipelago, see *Campbell & Poser*, pp.8-29 & 97-98.

<sup>2</sup> Here quoted from *Marsden 1834*, p.32; he discussed the languages of Madagascar on pp.31-35. See also *Gascoigne 1994*, pp.164-169.

<sup>3</sup> Even though L. Hervás y Panduro seemed to suggest something akin to *island hopping* in the dissemination of language from the Indian Archipelago to Madagascar; in the vastly enlarged Spanish edition of “Catalogo de Las Lenguas De Las Naciones Conocidas”, Hervás hypothesized that this island had been reached via ‘Indostan’ and the Maldives. (*Hervás 1801*, Vol.II, pp.46; this part does not seem to be included in the Italian original from 1784; Marsden had the Italian edition in his library before 1796. [*Marsden 1796*, p.28 and *Marsden 1827*, p.264])

<sup>4</sup> See in particular *Keevak* for an analysis of the shifting trends in the ascription of colour to the various people of Asia in general, and in this context especially of the *Malayan race*, which was only quite recently conceptualized as an autochthonous (biological) race by Blumenbach in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of his “De Generis Humani Varietate Nativa” from 1781, and first only fully described in the famous 3<sup>rd</sup> edition from 1795 (an English version did not appear until 1865 when the Anthropological Society published T. Bendyshe’s translation of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> editions. (See *Bendyshe-Blumenbach*, pp.vii-viii). In the identification of the Malay race in his 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Blumenbach extracted much ‘evidence’ from the information provided in the 1<sup>st</sup> ed. of Marsden’s HS, as it has recently been pointed out by D. Carroll. (*Carroll 2011*, p.271; also *Bendyshe-Blumenbach*, pp.145-276)

and language, as well as it delineated the ways that these were perceived to have influenced the progress or stagnation of civilization throughout history.

As such, these two research questions – regarding the origin, essence, and dissemination of the Malay on the one hand and the Malay element in the hybrid nature of the Malagasy societies on the other – highlight the entwined and co-dependent relationship of the analytical concepts through which these societies were approached, analyzed, and assessed. Furthermore, they amply illustrate the subtle interplay between the integrative and the dissociating factors involved in the narrative invoked to link up this vast, transoceanic super-region.

# 1. A ‘Strait’ Story: the Formative Years up to c.1820.

## 1.1 Malay, Polynesian, and Malayo-Polynesian: Entanglements and Conflations.

Before commencing my narrative, I should reiterate the vagueness surrounding the terminologies that were used in these days to designate the national (or ethnic), racial, and civilizational entities in general, as well as the appellations with which the specific entities in this region were denominated. P. Stock has recently emphasised how late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> C. discussions regarding the definitions, demarcations, and descriptions of human difference involved “several recurring and interlocking debates about human ‘nature’, hereditary qualities, climatic influence, and aesthetic judgements”<sup>1</sup> – to which one should add the crucial aspect regarding the spread (and patterns of mutual exchange) of civilization across space. All this implied that the notions of race, nation, and civilization were more often than not epistemologically intertwined and conceptually co-dependent both in terms of definition and demarcation. Rhetorically, they were often not merely applied in a diffuse manner – referring, as they did, to vaguely defined, interlocked, and rather opaque notions – but they appeared quite interchangeable too; even within the same discourse these terms could possess widely divergent meanings, as well as they could applied in different levels of scale.<sup>2</sup> These are all implications of what has been dubbed the ‘fluid articulation of human variety’<sup>3</sup> prevalent then; this, again, should caution us against any anachronistic or essentialist understandings of the concepts invoked in these historical discourses, as if they were exhaustively definable through a set of fixed and immutable characteristics.<sup>4</sup>

Hence the fields here referred to by *language*, *race*, *civilization*, and *nation* should *not* be perceived as having been regarded as discrete units, each enclosed from the others by watertight bulkheads. It was not merely the applied terminology that seemed interchangeable; the content and the connotations they referred to did also possess a much more intermixed character than the one with which they are usually vested today.

As we have seen in chapter 1 of Part II, the filling out of the vast geographical space between Madagascar and Easter Island involved several competing terminologies that each, albeit often only tacitly, relied on their own specific assumptions and premises regarding the linguistic, racial, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Stock, p.13. See also e.g. Malik, p.80.

<sup>2</sup> As we have seen in Part I where it was examined how Crawford within the span of one page could apply the term *race* to designate the shared characteristics of both a *national* and a larger *regional* population as well as referring to the *entire human race*. See also e.g. Stock; Trautmann 1997/2004, esp. pp.190-194; Kidd 2006, pp.1-18; and Malik.

<sup>3</sup> The phrase was coined by R. Wheeler in her “The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture” (2000) and later quoted in Stock (p.5).

<sup>4</sup> As Stock lucidly argues with regard to *race* (Stock, p.5); however, this assessment can also, *mutatis mutandis*, be extended to the terms *nation* and *civilization*, the meaning of which often appeared just as fluid and ambiguous.

historical essences of this super-region; the content and connotations vested in the geographical nomenclature were, as already analysed, derived precisely from such assumptions. And conversely, tracing the history of the region invariably involved a set of spatial and heuristic assumptions that a priori stipulated the field within which the historical discourse could be framed and materialized into a meaningful narrative.

Yet, not only was the same geographical field subjected to a series of competing terminologies that each claimed to authoritatively provide the most authentic representation of the region, but the same terms could also signify vastly different things within these competing discourses, or when invoked in different contexts. This was most acutely exemplified through the versatility of uses of the term *Malay*: a name repeatedly vested with multiple meanings. At times, the term Malay could thus refer to a *purely linguistic* entity, either denominating just one *single language* or an entire *language family*, whereas it at other times was used to define and describe a distinct *Malay race*; a race that was perceived as being composed by *all* the ‘brown- or yellow-complexioned’ people inhabiting this region, whether speaking the Malay language (either in its narrow or broad sense) or not.<sup>1</sup> In yet other contexts it was apparently a notion of a *Malay civilization* that was meant by the term: a peculiar civilization that seemed to be constrained to the coastal fringes of this part of the globe and which, in conjunction with the Javanese, represented its highest levels of civilization. Indeed, the Malay and Javanese seem to have been the only two autochthonous societies in the region who, in these British discourses, were endowed with some kind of historical agency.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, it could also designate a *Malay nation*, and hence refer to an assumedly ‘state-like’ entity characterized by possessing an own ethnic specificity.<sup>3</sup>

In sum, the meaning of the term *Malay* depended on the larger discourse in which it was embedded, and on the context in which it was articulated. It could refer to all the inhabitants of the entire region and address the questions regarding their origin, nation, race, or civilization, as well as

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the coining of a *Malay race* was, at least partially, the result of linguistic parameters; Blumenbach explicitly admitted so with regard to the terminology, but a linguistic rationale also appears to have been rather instrumental in demarcating the extent and scope of this race. (*Bendyshe-Blumenbach*, pp.275-276) With regard to the complexion of this race, opinions were divided; Kant had ascribed them a position among the *black race* (*Keevak*, p.61, and on Blumenbach’s sliding racial scale they were posited between the Caucasian centre and the Ethiopian extreme (p.275); Cuvier reduced the number of races to three, and, like Wallace later did, he posited the Malays in unequivocal terms as a subset of the Mongolian race. (See *Douglas & Ballard* and *Keevak*)

<sup>2</sup> I.e. containing the power to actually frame and enact their own historical destiny. See both *Koditschek 2010* and *Koditschek 2011* (esp. ch.5, in particular p.210) for a discussion of the criteria existent within British historical and colonial discourses that determined whether or not native societies could be ascribed an element of active agency.

<sup>3</sup> An important difference between their use of this term and the meaning which it primarily possesses today is the cogency of an assumed shared genealogy and consanguinity vested in the term then and accompanied by a relative downplaying of the political dimension. (*Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.191-192) However, in this context, speaking of a *Malay nation* almost always implied references to a shared history of political agency and attempts at expanding the existing Malay state-formations (notwithstanding whether these were supposed to be mainly imagined and mythological, or whether they were ascribed a value a genuine historical events!), and as such it did contain a clear political dimension. (For some recent, general discussions of the genesis and history/histories of Malayness and Malay political formations, see e.g. *Milner 2011* (esp. chapters 1-4) and *Andaya 2008* (in particular chapters 2-4).



it could deal with these questions within a markedly narrower framework demarcated by the extension of what was perceived as a Malay nation. At the same time its meaning could also be thematically restricted so that it referred to purely linguistic features, or it could primarily allude to aspects of civilization. Yet, more often than not the elements of race, nation, civilization, and language intersected each other in subtle and profound ways – as parts of the same entangled web of semantic co-dependency.

## **1.2 Tracing the Malayan Seat of Origin.**

When Marsden published his first writings on the Malay language and on the Malay inhabitants of Sumatra in the 1780s he was, if not breaking new ground, then at least erecting the first lasting edifice in this field. Although credited as “the first literary and scientific Englishman who, with the advantages of local experience, treated of the Malayan countries”<sup>1</sup>, Marsden’s “History of Sumatra” had, nonetheless, been preceded by at least two recent British texts dealing with the history and nature of that island; these were quite indicative of the general state of the knowledge of this region then, and hence they might deserve some mentioning here.

### **1.2.1 British Discourses on Sumatra before Marsden’s “History of Sumatra”.**

Without apparently possessing any personal experience of East, the physician and prolific political writer and pamphleteer, John Shebbeare (1709-1788) had in 1760 published a two volume “The History of the Sumatrans”.<sup>2</sup> However, the most remarkable characteristic that this, today rather obscure, work exhibited seems to have been its panegyric adulation of king George III.<sup>3</sup> The text itself, indeed, had hardly anything to do with the real conditions on Sumatra, whether present or past, nor did it intend to; on the contrary, it appears to have been conceived as a political allegory which, despite its exotic setting, conveyed much more about European political thinking than about Southeast Asian realities.<sup>4</sup> As such, it was more akin to the instructional fictions of the then fashionable chinoiserie than to the fact-focussed genre of the travelogue.<sup>5</sup> Little wonder then that the only time Shebbeare’s text is mentioned in Marsden’s writings is in a brief reference in his

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1856*, p.271. (under the entry on ‘Marsden’). A. Hamilton had already in 1810 stated that his “account of Sumatra is a model for future travellers”. (*Hamilton 1810*, p.390) The Duke of Sussex, the President of the Royal Society, had in 1836, stated that Marsden’s HS “may be considered as a model for all monographs of the history, languages, customs, and statistics of a particular nation” (quoted in *Marsden 1838*, p.139) This assessment has by and large been reproduced in most later literature (see e.g. *Bastin 1965a*, p.256; *Boon*, pp.30-34; *Quilty*, pp.4 & 9-10; *Aljunied 2005*, p.17; and *Andaya 2008*, p.100.

<sup>2</sup> See the bibliography for the full title of this book.

<sup>3</sup> This later secured Shebbeare a pension of 200 £. See the ODNB article on John Shebbeare by M.J. Cardwell.

<sup>4</sup> This view is confirmed by a cursory reading of the few pages of the text. (see *Shebbeare*) Later it has been described as a “satirical chronicle of the Whig administration disguised as a history of Sumatra. England is Sumatra, London is Achin, Spain is Cochin China, Hanover is Golconda, and the like.” (*Foster*, p.1036) For more on Shebbeare’s rambles into the genre of (fictional) travel literature, see the scattered references to him in *Adams 1983*.

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. *Spence*, ch.4 and *Jones 2001*, ch.1.

“Biblioteca Marsdeniana”, in which it was labelled as “a political and satirical work, under feigned names of places and persons”.<sup>1</sup>

More factual substance could evidently be found in Charles Miller’s article entitled “An Account of the island of Sumatra”, published in 1778 in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society.<sup>2</sup> Miller had, just like Marsden, an extensive personal experience of the island, gained from a stay at Fort Marlborough, Bencoolen from 1770 and onwards.<sup>3</sup> The content of the article, composed of extracts from Miller’s letters to friends back home,<sup>4</sup> reflected his professional interest in natural history; this was probably spurred by the fact that he was commissioned by the EIC as a botanist with the explicit assignment of examining the possibilities of introducing the cultivation of plants that could break the Dutch spice monopoly.<sup>5</sup> Yet, in the spirit of his age, he also found time and occasion to dwell on the local inhabitants – both the Malays along the coast and the Bataks in the interior.<sup>6</sup> In her study of natural history in the Malayan realm within a context of colonial science, J. Kathirithamby-Wells has emphasised how Miller, as a naturalist, interacted daily with native informants; this also facilitated his ethnographic studies which thus seemed quite seamlessly linked to his pursuit of natural history, in theory as well as in practice, given that they both served the same imperial design.<sup>7</sup> Although his contributions were later recognized,<sup>8</sup> his function appeared more to have been to foreshadow Marsden’s results than to produce anything in his own right, and as such a precursor he was also duly quoted in Marsden’s HS.<sup>9</sup>

### 1.2.2 Early Malay Dictionaries in a New Imperial Context: Bowrey to Howison.

As R. Jones has shown in his meticulous study of the early developments of the study of Malay on the British Isles, this consisted almost exclusively of texts originally written by continental scholars, missionaries, or traders, and subsequently translated into English.<sup>10</sup> The only exception appeared to be Thomas Bowrey’s Malay-English and English-Malay dictionary, with a short

---

<sup>1</sup> *Marsden 1827*, pp.119 & 235.

<sup>2</sup> Just like some of Marsden’s earliest articles; Marsden’s most important articles, i.e. those on language, were, however, published in *Archæologia* (the journal issued by the Society of Antiquaries from 1770 and onwards) – a clear indication of the close “connection between antiquarian interests and the anthropological study of language” in those days (*Gascoigne 1994*, pp.131-132)

<sup>3</sup> *Glyn*, p.291.

<sup>4</sup> *Miller*, p.160.

<sup>5</sup> *Kathirithamby-Wells*, pp.345-346.

<sup>6</sup> See *Miller*. He operated with a categorical distinction between the coastal Malays, who were under a clear influence by Arabian civilization, and the people of the interior who still preserved their original culture.

<sup>7</sup> *Kathirithamby-Wells*, p.346.

<sup>8</sup> In his “General View of the World” from 1807, Rev. E. Blomfield, thus stated that “no account had been given of this island by any Englishman till the year 1778, when Mr. Charles Miller (son of the late botanical gardener) published an account of the manners of a particular district”. (*Blomfield*, Vol.II, p.370)

<sup>9</sup> Both in the first two editions and even more frequently in the third, 1811 edition; Marsden’s references to Miller was from this article, from Miller’s entries in the Company’s records at Bencoolen (*Marsden 1811*, p.158), and from personal communication while they both were stationed at Sumatra (*Marsden 1811*, p.393). Although primarily using him as an authority on botanical questions, he also occasionally referred to his ethnographic observations.

<sup>10</sup> *Jones 1984*, pp.121-122.

grammar attached, from 1701; Jones hypothesized that this path-breaking book may have been the ironic outcome of “the fact that Bowrey probably had no knowledge of Dutch, and may not even have been aware that books on Malay had been published previously.”<sup>1</sup> Unlike the earlier books on this topic in English, produced by university employed scholars back in England, Bowrey’s text was the result of a prolonged stay as a merchant in the region. Bowrey had apparently gained an extensive knowledge of this lingua franca, indispensable for conducting trade in this region.<sup>2</sup> His dictionary hence provided an early example of the kind of knowledge production that derived from purely practical exigencies and which was facilitated by a very instrumentalist approach to language.<sup>3</sup> Although Marsden later described Bowrey’s book as “the work of an illiterate person”<sup>4</sup> – a fact that seemed to account for its lack of orthographical and organizational consistency – Bowrey was, nevertheless, lauded by his British successors as their forerunner in the study of Malay. So, despite all its flaws, Bowrey’s dictionary was a recognized landmark to which both Marsden and Leyden felt obliged to pay homage, even if this was not without reservations. According to Marsden, Bowrey possessed an “extensive knowledge of the language”, and his book should be ascribed “considerable merit” albeit it was clearly the work of a person “entirely ignorant of the written language”. Thus, when subjected to the criteria dictated by the more elevated realms of Orientalist knowledge – with its often implicit, yet always present, emphasis on a set of canonical texts and a primacy of ancient over present language<sup>5</sup> – Bowrey’s text inevitably appeared rather vulgar, as a mere practical manual devoid of the higher learning required when writing a genuine dictionary.<sup>6</sup> John Leyden had earlier (1808) expressed an opinion similar to Marsden’s when he deemed Bowrey’s book to be “a work great merit and labour”.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jones 1984, p.128.,

<sup>2</sup> For more on the circumstances under which Bowrey conceived the idea of this dictionary, see Echols, pp.13-14. See also Jones 1984 for further information on the production and publication of this book to which the famous orientalist Thomas Hyde contributed; see also Marsden 1812, Vol.I, p.xlii.

<sup>3</sup> The tension between practical utility and theoretical interest (even though these two levels always were intricately intertwined) had been apparent from the first Malayan vocabulary published by the chronicler of the Magellan voyage, Pigafetta. For an analysis of this, its epistemic structure, and conceptual arrangements, see Boon, pp.9-12.

<sup>4</sup> Marsden 1812, Vol.I, p.lx

<sup>5</sup> Although the acquiring of oriental languages always also served a very practical and pragmatic purpose within the colonial knowledge production – as it is probably most lucidly argued in B.S. Cohn’s seminal essay “The Command of Language and the Language of Command” (reprinted in Cohn 1996, pp.16-56) – I nevertheless think that Marsden’s approach here proves Said’s point quite well. Said claimed that “academic orientlists for the most part were interested in the classical period of whatever language or society it was they studied.” (Said 1995, p.52) Although Marsden actually never was an academic in the straight sense of the word, but rather he complied with the British role model of the dedicated gentleman whose amateurish pursuits led him to become the foremost in his field.

<sup>6</sup> Marsden 1812, Vol.I, pp.xl-xlii. Marsden thus elaborated that “owing to his want of sufficiency in this [proper knowledge of written Malay] and some other respects, he has unavoidably fallen into numerous errors, and the sentences he has employed to exemplify the words, being in his own composition, and *not quotations, are for the most part incorrect or vulgar, and uncouth in their phraseology.*” (my italics)

<sup>7</sup> Leyden’s assessment was more positive than Marsden’s; he thus stressed that, although Bowrey only had used English characters (and not the modified Arabic alphabet in which Malay usually was written), he had, nonetheless, obtained that “the pronunciation and the signification of words are given with great accuracy”. (Leyden 1811, pp.185-86)

It was in this scantily explored and sketchily charted realm of study that Marsden's HS, together with his articles on language, made such a cogent impact; it immediately became the uncontested beacon of knowledge and information which set out the course to be followed by his successors. His predecessors were, as we have seen, few and their impact negligible. Not even J. Howison's publication in 1801 of a "Dictionary of the Malay Tongue, as Spoken in the Peninsula of Malacca", with a grammar attached, could alter this impression.<sup>1</sup> Despite its own pretensions of providing the means of "clearing the way for the future labours of the philosopher, the navigator, and the merchant of every nation"<sup>2</sup> working in this region, both Leyden and Marsden agreed in condemning this attempt as a failure.<sup>3</sup> By the latter it was even deemed injurious to the quest of obtaining a true knowledge of Malay. Instead of remedying the "want of skill in the native dialects", as it claimed to do, and which had "been even known to prove prejudicial to the Company's [i.e. EIC's] interests in a political point of view",<sup>4</sup> Marsden decried its potentially negative influence "which may be sustained by the servants of the East-India Company and others, into whose hands it may have been put for instruction". This sad state of affairs was a matter of national importance.<sup>5</sup> His diatribe against Howison's book did not end here; not only could the material interests of the EIC and the British crown in the region be at risk, but it also compromised the reputation of British scholars, and hence it put national pride in jeopardy. Marsden thus insisted on the "injury done by a work of this description, to the literary reputation of the country among foreign oriental scholars".<sup>6</sup> Rather than engaging the work on its own admitted terms,<sup>7</sup> Marsden – by now a reputable metropolitan scholar and one of the most accomplished scions within the Banksian system of patronage<sup>8</sup> – once more

---

<sup>1</sup> As could be read in it, and as emphasised by both Leyden and Marsden, this publication was not original but rather a reworked version of Bowrey's 100 years old, and by now exceedingly rare, Dictionary and grammar. Its most innovative, and controversial, feature was the abandonment of the sole use of Roman letters and the attempt to introduce Persian (not modified Arabic!) letters instead. (an explanation of this choice is offered in *Howison*, pp.vii-x)

<sup>2</sup> *Howison*, p.iii.

<sup>3</sup> See *Leyden 1811*, p.186 and *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, pp.xliii-xlv; both agree on denouncing its poor way of blindly copying Richardson's and Gilchrist's method of transcribing Hindustani and Persian (see also *Cohn 1996*, pp.34-43), and thus having introduced a method unsuitable to the orthography and phonetics of the Malay language, as well as being utterly foreign to the ways in which learned Malays would actually write the language themselves!

<sup>4</sup> *Howison*, p.vii..

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.xlv.

<sup>6</sup> *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.xliv.

<sup>7</sup> Viz. that of aspiring to a pragmatic applicability rather than academic precision. With regard to the grammar, Howison thus admitted that in "our grammatical department it may be objected that we have *forced the inflexions of our nouns and verbs into a resemblance to those of European languages, beyond what the simplicity of the Malay will admit of*"; yet he defended this approach by a recourse to its strictly pragmatic value, and although "grammarians might not consider [it] strictly as such, still a ten years' acquaintance with the Malays and their language authorize us in adopting the words and arrangements, which *we are certain, will be understood and are used by them.*" (*Howison*, p.iv; my italics)

<sup>8</sup> Marsden had come a long way since he in March 1780 was introduced to Sir Joseph Banks and his circle of protégés; Marsden had since become a member of all the important learned societies and moved effortlessly within the most influential circles of society; as vice-president of the Royal Society he presided over its meetings during the aging and ailing Banks' frequent absences. (*Marsden 1838*, for the latter, see p.104. For the importance of the Banks circle in the formation of British colonial science, see e.g. *Gascoigne 1994*, *Gascoigne 1998*, and *Gascoigne 2011*)

denounced what did not live up to his own high standards of Oriental scholarship. The decried culprit, however, was not as much the gentleman James Howison, a physician and member of the Asiatic Society:<sup>1</sup> his sole mistake was, without foreseeing its sad results, to have lent his name to this disreputable book which, in reality, was composed by some anonymous hack.<sup>2</sup> By such a categorical rebuttal of what a later writer has called an early example of applied (linguistic) anthropology,<sup>3</sup> Marsden simultaneously vindicated the position of his own branch of erudite oriental scholarship as representing the unassailable authority in the field.

The implications of Leyden's and in particular Marsden's severe critique was devastating; despite having received a rather positive review by the Scottish Orientalist Alexander Hamilton<sup>4</sup> who, in 1801, commended its pragmatic decision of "retaining the grammatical arrangements of European languages",<sup>5</sup> its truth claims were by now shattered, and hence it was stripped of all aspirations of authority. Consequentially, Howison's text only very rarely appeared in later debates on the nature and origin of the Malay language, -nation, -race, or civilization. Yet, despite its later obscurity, this did not prevent it from having had at least some impact in its own time. Thus, for instance, when a young Rasmus Rask taught himself Malay and some of its kindred languages in Copenhagen during the years 1809-1811, he referred to his use of Howison's grammar and dictionary together with some older Dutch texts composed by Werndly and Loder.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to find much more material on Howison, apart from what is stated the published dictionary and in the reviews of it; his name appears on the lists of members of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal, and he also seems to have been the author of a short article on "An Account of the Chinese Method of propagating Fruit Trees by Abscission", in "A Journal of Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, and the Arts", Vol.XXII, pp.321-324, London 1809.

<sup>2</sup> *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.xlv; Marsden thus seemed to be at real pains in trying to exculpate Howison, a gentleman and fellow member of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal, from any real complicity in the making of this discreditable book.

<sup>3</sup> Described as so by Raymond Firth in *Firth*, p.154; Firth, however, did not state anything about the quality, or reliability, of this early instance of *applied anthropology*!

<sup>4</sup> A. Hamilton was the first to hold a professorship in Sanskrit in Britain (in 1808, at East India College at Haileybury). Besides being an avid contributor to the *Monthly Review* and to the *Edinburgh Review* on oriental topics, it was also Hamilton who, when marooned in Paris after the breakdown of the Peace at Amiens (May 23, 1803), taught Sanskrit to a number of continental scholars, incl. F. Schlegel; these would in time become the prominent Orientalists who shifted the centre of the most outstanding oriental knowledge from the British Isles to the European continent. (On Hamilton as a oriental scholar, see e.g. *Rocher 1970 & Rocher 2002*, *Rendall*, esp. pp.52-54, and *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.138-142) Although never having visited the Malay region, this did not deter him from writing as an authority on this region.

<sup>5</sup> *Hamilton 1802*, p.42. The author of this review did also discuss at length all the reservations that Marsden, the acknowledged foremost expert in this field, would undoubtedly entertain given his approach to the study of language in general and *primitive* languages like Malay in particular.(pp.41-42; he here quoted sentences from HS, [can be found in *Marsden 1784*, pp.161-162])

<sup>6</sup> Rask quoted in *Pedersen*, pp18-20. These references, in conjunction with other allusions to Howison, seem to indicate that Rask's road to Malay went through J.C. Adelung's "Mithridates"; in the first volume of this, published in 1806, Adelung referred to these three authors in his examination of the existing literature on the Malayan language. (*Adelung & Vater*, Vol.I, pp.102-104) Rask did not state explicitly whether he had direct access to Howison's book, as he had to the Dutch ones (the University library possessed editions of these), or whether he only knew it through Adelung.

### 1.2.3 War and Empire: the Colonial Context of the *First Discursive Moment*.

The first decisive *discursive moment* in the context of this study probably occurred during the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> C.<sup>1</sup> It was initiated already in 1808 when John Leyden published his “On the Languages and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations”,<sup>2</sup> but it did not manifest itself until the publication of Marsden’s 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of HS in 1811 and his “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malayan Language” the year after. In the wake of these books followed an intense discussion involving oppositional, conflicting, and at times deeply interwoven ideas on the origin and nature of the Malayan language as well as its relations to human nature, history, and society.

It undoubtedly contributed significantly to the creation of this discursive moment that the publication of these books coincided with decisive political events in the region. In 1811 – after having ousted the French from their last strongholds in the Indian Ocean, Ile de France (Mauritius) and Ile de Bourbon (Reunion)<sup>3</sup> – a huge Anglo-Indian force composed more than 100 ships (among these 4 ships of the line and 14 frigates) and almost 12,000 soldiers<sup>4</sup> left Penang for Java under the personal command of Gn.-Gov. Ld. Minto. The primary objective was to deprive the French and their allies of their last possessions in the region, albeit some people within the EIC, like Raffles, also dreamt of expanding British trade and possessions further into this region; the Court of Directors back in London, however, did as usual their utmost to prevent the further expenditure that such new conquests inevitably brought.<sup>5</sup> Java, together with the Spice Islands<sup>6</sup> and the rest of the outposts of the Dutch East Indies, were conquered with relative ease, and when Ld. Minto returned to India in Oct. 1811 he left Java under the administration of the EIC and with Stamford Raffles in charge as Lt.-Gov.<sup>7</sup> Among his subordinates was a then quite unknown assistant surgeon by the name John Crawfurd who, in due time, would prove his worth in the East Indian realm as a gifted linguist, assiduous administrator, and skilled diplomat.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although I here trace its repercussions all the way up the publication of HIA in 1820.

<sup>2</sup> For more on the composition, context, and reception of Leyden’s “On the Language and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations”, see *Hooker & Hooker*, esp. pp.26-30, *Van Driem*, pp.233-235; and *Trautmann 2006*, pp.86-96. Contemporary accounts hereof can be encountered in *Morton*, esp. pp.lv-lvii, whereas Walter Scott’s and Robert White’s memoirs are chiefly constrained to Leyden’s poetical and philological work back in Scotland (on this and its relations to his later philological work in Asia, see also *Hooker & Hooker*, pp.2-6)

<sup>3</sup> For a recent narrative of the events that led up to these invasions, see *Taylor*.

<sup>4</sup> Both numbers are taken from *Thorn 1815*, pp.16 &18.

<sup>5</sup> A thorough description of all the main political events and their larger contexts during the invasion and occupation of Java can be found in *Wurtzburg*, pp.157-400; for a recent, brief analysis, see *Carey 2010*, esp. pp.176-180.

<sup>6</sup> The *Spice Islands* lie in the Molucca Sea, east of Java, and consist, among others of Ternate, Tidore (the ‘Clove Islands’), the famed Amboyna (Ambonia), and the Banda Islands (the ‘Nutmeg Islands’), as well as the larger, but in this context less important, Gilolo (Halmahera), Bouro, and Ceram.

<sup>7</sup> The Spice Islands (Moluccas) had all been captured the year before (*Thorn 1815*, pp.343-359); administratively they remained directly responsible to India (*Wurtzburg*, pp.204-05), and hence outside of Raffles’s direct influence.

The sheer size of this expedition, coupled with the fabled riches that the, recently bankrupt, Dutch East Indies were reputed to contain,<sup>1</sup> stirred both the imagination and nurtured the craving for new knowledge about this region. There was, in short, a hungry market to feed, and this resulted, for instance, in the opportunistic publication of hastily assembled (today we would probably say “copy-pasted”) compilations of texts, such as J.J. Stockdale’s “Island of Java” in 1811.<sup>2</sup> So, even though there is no indication of Marsden ever having this in mind when he published his books on this region, the timing was certainly perfect.<sup>3</sup> Notwithstanding whatever intentions that may have influenced Marsden’s production of these texts, they were eagerly consumed by a readership who were shaped by these very present political developments: the scope of their reception thus went far beyond the narrow circles of oriental scholars and EIC civil servants with a scholarly inclination. By now it concerned everybody; it was a question of national interest to know the true nature of the colonized peoples as well as of the most powerful native nations in the Indian Archipelago.<sup>4</sup> Both the governing bodies and the general public relied on a very limited number of British experts on this region to provide this specialized knowledge. The reliability ascribed to these did not solely depend on observations drawn from an extensive personal experience in the region,<sup>5</sup> or on being in possession of an amassed amount of information; rather it rested on 1) a personal credibility as an impeccable *gentleman*<sup>6</sup> who 2) possessed the ability of abstraction and could subject such information to an acknowledged system of classification that would turn it into categorized and

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Vlekke*, chapters 10-11, *Wright 1961*, pp26-63, and *Boxer 1965*, ch.10 on the economic crisis in the Dutch East Indies during the late 18<sup>th</sup> C. and the dissolution of the VOC in 1795; see *Marshall 1988* for an analysis of the British views on the Dutch East Indies around 1800.

<sup>2</sup> As a rationale for publishing this book Stockdale stated that “the subject, in itself interesting, is rendered much more so by the probability of the many new sources of enterprise, which will now be opened to the view of that liberal, extensive, and spirited commerce, which has so highly contributed to enable this kingdom to present itself an insurmountable barrier to the atrocious schemes of that enemy of the human race, Napoleon Buonaparte.” (*Stockdale*, p.vii) Later he would, however, almost excuse the shabby nature of the book by adding: “In the space of time, perhaps unprecedentedly short, the editor has translated, selected, and compiled, the subsequent “Sketches”... The effort, at any rate, is not very ambitious; and, although it cannot entitle him to literary reputation, he trusts that its avowed production on the spur of the moment, will shelter him from the severity of that criticism, which has often shown itself indulgent to his lowly endeavours.” (pp.ix-x) For more on this book and Stockdale’s career as publisher, see J. Basin’s introduction to the reprint of this book (*Bastin 1995*)

<sup>3</sup> According to Marsden’s memoir, HS went into print already in 1810 while the first sheets of the Grammar and the Dictionary did so in early 1811; besides both texts had been planned and worked upon during several years. (*Marsden 1838*, pp.139 & 143-44)

<sup>4</sup> Apart from the vastly superior quality of these texts produced by Marsden et al, the circumstances certainly favoured the reception of their texts in a way that Howison did not experience, even though he explicitly claimed that “as to the utility of the present publication no objection can be justly offered ... since our establishment at (Pulo Piniang) Prince of Wales’s Island, it has become of such consequence as to render every means of facilitating a communication between us and the Malays a question of national importance.” *Howison*, p.iii) But neither the ‘official mind’ nor the public were apparently at that time (1801) as eager as Howison was!

<sup>5</sup> which Leyden did *not* have, for instance; his entire personal experience of the region was based on a brief furlough spend there in 1805 for health reasons, and where he spent most of the time with Raffles and his wife, Olivia; his profound learning and avid curiosity left a lasting impression on the recently arrived Raffles who, apart from his illustrious political career, would also try to emulate Leyden’s scholarly pursuits (*Wurtzburg*, pp.35-39)

<sup>6</sup> This interesting question of the socio-cultural criteria determining authority and personal credibility in the context of knowledge production on distant places and past times has been examined more at depth in Part II, chapter 3.

applicable knowledge. Among such experts were the London-based Marsden and the late Leyden; before joining the expedition to Java that led to his premature death on August 28, 1811, Leyden had been employed as professor of Hindustani at the College of Ft. William in Calcutta, apart from fulfilling other more remunerative posts facilitated by his patron, Ld. Minto;<sup>1</sup> These two authorities were later followed by Raffles and, in time, by Crawford.

#### 1.2.4 Leyden on the Origin and History of the Malay Language and Nation.

When Marsden published his *Grammar of the Malayan Language* in 1812 he took great pains at refuting Leyden's critique of both his general theory on language formation with its primary focus on genealogy, and of his hypothesis regarding the origin and dissemination of the Malay language. Marsden in particular addressed Leyden's flat denial of the existence of the original insular family of languages, by Marsden denominated the Polynesian and which later became known as the Malayo-Polynesian. Through the disavowal of both the genealogical model and the assumption of the presence of an original stock of languages in this region, Leyden's approach represented a fundamental reconfiguration of the framework in which the Malay language and the people who spoke it were inscribed.

Leyden claimed that Marsden "by attempting to prove too much, however, I apprehend, that he has failed essentially. He has pointed out a few coincidences, but has left the mass of the language totally unaccounted for."<sup>2</sup> Indeed, he went even further in his refutation; rather than being the best known and most diffused specimen of the Hither Polynesian languages, Leyden held that Malay was, on the contrary, a *hybrid language* – a fairly recent product of intermixture between different peoples and civilizations along the coastal fringes of the Malacca strait. "It may safely be affirmed that neither the *Malay lingua franca* of commerce, nor any of the maritime dialects of *Malayu* existed previous to the era of Mahummed, in a state similar to that in which they appear at present; and these dialects seem to comprehend all that are usually included under the denomination of the *Malayu* language."<sup>3</sup> So, even though he agreed with Marsden in identifying three different main components in the Malay language – viz. a native one, Sanskrit, and Arabic<sup>4</sup> – their assessment of these diverged at its very core. According to his methodology of the word list, Marsden ascribed a theoretical primacy to the *native part*, in which all the "simple ideas" that defined the core of any language could be amply expressed; the two other were then perceived as later, and in this context rather contingent, additions – merely polishing the language and rendering it more sophisticated. Leyden, however, approached the Malay language from the opposite direction: first he detected the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Hooker & Hooker, pp.7-11 and Trautmann 2006, pp.86-89.

<sup>2</sup> Leyden 1811, p.167.

<sup>3</sup> Leyden 1811, p.168; Leyden's italics. See also Hooker & Hooker, p.28 for more on the context of this critique.

<sup>4</sup> See Leyden 1811, pp.168-175 and Marsden 1798, esp. pp.228-230.



Sanskrit and Arabian components (that is, especially in the form of ‘words’), and then these were defined as constituting the most important parts of the language; what then remained unaccounted for, the linguistic residue so to speak, by implication had to be composed of the “part of the language, which in comparison of the rest, may be termed native or original.”<sup>1</sup> Leyden actually doubted the *true originality*<sup>2</sup> of this native part, and, instead of finding it “expressive of the most simple class of our ideas”<sup>3</sup>, he deemed it to be “in reality, more corrupted and mixed, than those parts which are confessedly derived from a foreign source.”<sup>4</sup> The most important aspect in this context was the manner in which this latter part was defined in exclusively negative terms – as all that could not be positively stated to be derived from Sanskrit or Arabic. This seemed to connote that it did not possess any positive worth in itself, neither as an object worth of study nor as a quintessential element in the composition of the language.

As with language, so with history. The Malayan *nation* did not exist as such before the arrival of Indian and Arabian traders to the region; these brought with them the level of civilization and the religious creed that in Leyden’s own time had come to define the Malay *nation* as an ethnic entity endowed with its own identity, and which demarcated their polity from that of the other peoples in the region. Malay, then, was an inherently polished language that had originated in the encounter between Indian civilization, Arab religious zeal, and the natives of the region. Leyden thus spoke of how “the Malay history and the language itself, exhibit traces sufficiently clear, to direct us to *the region, with which the Malays had the most frequent intercourse, at an early period, and from their language seems to have received the most considerable modifications*”;<sup>5</sup> and that was India, the eastern coast of Kalinga to be more exact. Before then the Malays were only Malays in the broad, *racial* sense of the term. This seems in Leyden’s discourse to have been a rather insignificant category,<sup>6</sup> subjected, as it was, to the primacy of language; a primacy based both on its function as the most adequate gateway to the past “in the paucity of existing monuments”, and as the constituting ingredient in the formation of the historical units or entities through which the past was

---

<sup>1</sup> Leyden 1811, p.173.

<sup>2</sup> In the meaning positively – and not merely heuristically – autochthonous to this region, and as such it would not be possible to prove that it had been derived from languages spoken in other regions. Leyden suspected that, with more knowledge of these languages, they could be proved to ultimately be affiliated with some of the monosyllabic languages spoken on the neighbouring Asian continent, such as Thai or Burmese. (Leyden 1811, p.164)

<sup>3</sup> Leyden 1811, p.173.

<sup>4</sup> Leyden 1811, p.173. “Foreign source” chiefly referred to Sanskrit and Arabic.

<sup>5</sup> Leyden 1811, p.171; my italics.

<sup>6</sup> The article only contained scant references to this racial aspect, whether biologically defined, as Blumenbach did, or classified along linguistic criteria as in Marsden’s writings; however, Leyden did state that given the Malay language had “been propagated by a *race* more skilled in arms than in letters, it has branched out into almost as many dialects as states, *by mixing in different proportions with the native languages of the aboriginal races.*” (Leyden 1811, p.163; my italics) The term *race* was here only vested with a vague and rather ambiguous meaning.

structured.<sup>1</sup> Repudiating both Marsden's theory of Malay belonging to the autochthonous Polynesian language family and Sir William Jones's surmise of its ultimate origin in Sanskrit,<sup>2</sup> Leyden instead adopted a quite narrow definition of Malay, both in terms of classificatory scope and historical depth. This facilitated a more intimate relation between language and recorded history, both with regard to the causal relation between the two and to their heuristic function as sources of history; hence Leyden assessed the study of the two as absolutely inseparable:

“This is the circumstance which renders the investigation of the *origin and relations of the Malayu language* a matter of difficulty, as it becomes *necessary to examine the history of the nation, as well as the structure and composition of the language itself*. Though used by a *nation of comparatively late origin*, at least with respect to the principal features which it at present presents, the history of the nation is still very obscure, rather, it may be presumed, from the want of investigation, than from the want of materials for its illustration. *The history of the origin and progress of the Malayu tongue, of course partakes of this obscurity*”.<sup>3</sup>

What is particularly striking here is the fundamental way in which language was historicised, rather than referring to a core of originality that could be isolated and then invoked as incarnating the true ethnic identity. It was recent history, not a distant origin, that determined the Malay language and identity. This paved the way for a larger inclusion of written source-materials of European, Indian, and native provenance in the examination of “the history of the origin and progress of the Malayu tongue”. Leyden was thus a pioneer in the (British) use of the content in Malay manuscripts as a relatively reliable source of their own history. In contrast to Crawford who, as we examined in Part II, only found use of these texts as vestiges of the rudeness of civilization and its accompanying intellectual poverty, Leyden, on the other hand, valued the “many Malayu compositions of a historical nature”.<sup>4</sup> He maintained that “though occasionally embellished by fiction, it is only from them that we can obtain any outline of the Malay history, and of the progress of the nations.”<sup>5</sup> It seems illustrative of the unconventionality of such an approach that Raffles

---

<sup>1</sup> Leyden thus claimed that “no better method presented itself, either for *classing their tribes*, or laying a *foundation for historical researches*, than by examining the mutual relation of the several languages which are current among them. This method, when applied on an extensive scale, is always the surest clue for developing the *origin of a nation*, and indicating the revolutions to which it may have been subjected, either by *foreign conquest or colonization*.” (Leyden 1811, p.162; my italics)

<sup>2</sup> Leyden 1811, pp. 166 & 168.

<sup>3</sup> Leyden 1811, pp.163-164; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Leyden thus, rather surprisingly, identified a genuine historiographical *genre* within the Malay literature; in doing this he definitely differed from many of his contemporary peers such as Crawford (see also Hooker & Hooker, p.29)

<sup>5</sup> Leyden 1811, p.180. Raffles would later emulate this assessment in a letter addressed to Marsden and written on Jan. 1<sup>st</sup>, 1815. (Reprinted in Raffles 1835, Vol.I, p.258)

would later find it necessary to emphasize it as the outcome of methodological deliberations, rather than as a result of a credulous mind.<sup>1</sup> Leyden was, Raffles, told us:

“... aware, that, in these islands, as well as on the continent of India, the commencement of *authentic history* was only to be dated from the introduction of Mahometanism; but, in the wild traditions of the Malays, he thought he sometimes discovered a glimmering of light, which might, perhaps, serve to illustrate an earlier period. These glimmerings, he was accustomed to say, were very faint, but, in the absence of all other lights, they were worth pursuing; they would, at all events, account for and explain many of the peculiar institutions and customs of the people, and serve to make his countrymen better acquainted with a race who appeared to him to possess the greatest claims to their consideration and attention.”<sup>2</sup>

This pursuit would result in the posthumous publication of the “Malay Annals” in 1821, with an introduction written by Raffles. Based on one of the manuscript versions of the *Sejarah Melayu*,<sup>3</sup> it narrated the (mythological) story of the founding of Malacca, and it was the first full translation of a Malay text into English.<sup>4</sup> Apart from being an indeed very gifted Orientalist scholar, and one of the earliest erudite Englishmen to collect Malay manuscripts and study the language in depth, another reason pointed in the direction that Leyden should be the first to undertake this endeavour of translation; it simply made much more sense to do so within his framework than, for instance, it did to Marsden with his focus on origin and genealogical descent – let alone than it did to Crawford!

---

<sup>1</sup> As Hooker and Hooker observed: “Unlike later British scholars who were rather scathing about the narrative’s content, he [Leyden] was certainly more tolerant and appreciative in having a real respect for ‘ancient’ myths, such as the Celtic myth of Ossian [a discovery/fabrication by J. Macpherson in mid-18<sup>th</sup> C.; the issue of its authenticity is still debated], which he had pursued in the Scottish Highlands a decade earlier.” (*Hooker & Hooker*, p.36)

<sup>2</sup> *Raffles 1821*, p.vi, the italics are mine.

<sup>3</sup> See *Milner 2002*, pp.19-25 and *Milner 2011*, pp.90-91 for a discussion of the compositions and functions of this narrative in its various manuscript forms in the Malay realm. As observed by Reid, the “Malay Annals”, or “*Sejarah Melayu*”, was the name given by Raffles to a set Malay manuscripts that originally went under the name “The Rule of all Rajahs”, or “Peraturan Segala Raja-Raja” or in Arabic “*Sulalat Us-Salatin*”. (*Reid 2001*, p.303) The orthography and translation given in *Andaya 2008* deviate somewhat (“The Genealogy of Kings”). (p.251)

<sup>4</sup> Leyden translated the text in close collaboration with a Ibrahim munshi (or Ibrahim Candu) who, according to Hooker and Hooker’s research seemed to undertake most of the actual translation which Leyden then transcribed and polished (*Hooker & Hooker*, p.35). An orientalist, later identified as Crawford (*Skinner*, p.204), wrote in one of the marginal annotations that he had made in his own manuscript copy of this text about Leyden’s “Malay Annals” that: “this translation is merely a free rendering of some of the principal incidents it [*Sejarah Melayu*] contains, Ibrahim the Moonshee made a copy of the *Salelata Salatin* [*Sulalat Us-Salatin*] at Malacca, and took it with him to Bengal, where he was in the service of Dr. Leyden. Ibrahim read the book to the Doctor and explained the meaning to him, and he [i.e. Leyden] wrote down what he seems to have considered as worthy of notice. This is the account which Ibrahim gives me. It would indeed be tedious to translate all the prolixity and repetitions of a Malayan author, but his translation is tolerably faithful. There is considerable variation in the Malayan copies.” (Quoted in *Low 1849*, p.20) Andaya explained this “variation in the Malayan copies” by pointing to the fact that “in the Malay world a copyist’s task was to ‘improve’ a text to accord with current social and political realities. It often resulted in the expunging and inserting of information to support the genealogical claims of powerful families.” (*Andaya 2008*, p.251) It appears that Leyden’s methodological procedure, probably inadvertently, actually followed the same track as these!

### 1.2.5 Raffles' Discourses on the Malay Nation and Race.

In an article read at the Asiatic Society in Bengal in 1809 and published the following year, Raffles had himself written “On the Maláyu Nation, with a Translation of Its Maritime Institutions”. Here he had argued that the *Malayan Group*, roughly equivalent to Marsden’s Hither Polynesia or Malayan Archipelago, was peopled by both Malays and “*nations* radically distinct from the *Malays*, who speak languages entirely different, and use various written characters, *original* and peculiar to each.”<sup>1</sup> Although ultimately “the *Malayu language* may be traced to a still further extent, and particularly among the South-Sea islands”, as Marsden had claimed already in 1780, this fell outside of Raffles’s agenda which primarily was targeted at what he identified as the *Malay nation*.

Raffles perceived the Malay *nation* as, unlike most other nations, being composed of a cluster of communities hugging the shorelines of Sumatra, the Malay Peninsula, Borneo and many of the smaller islands in the region; the only, and very important, exception was Menangkabau, situated on the alluvial plains in the Sumatran highlands.<sup>2</sup> Yet, everywhere else the inland was inhabited by “*nations* radically distinct from the Malays”, and whose roots of civilization appeared to be of a different origin.<sup>3</sup> So, in Raffles’s view, how did the Malays distinguish themselves from the other native *nations*, and what actually bound them together as one *nation*, when it was not a coherent, shared space as was normally expected?<sup>4</sup> As the quotations above indicate, Raffles continued in the same vein as Marsden and Leyden, and he ascribed the linguistic criterion a paramount role in establishing the boundaries of demarcation between the different groups of peoples, or nations; it was thus primarily along the lines of language that the Malays could be distinguished from the other, radically different nations in the region.<sup>5</sup>

In explicit opposition to Marsden<sup>6</sup> Raffles emphasized the linguistic coherence between all the Malay speaking communities; hence – instead of perceiving “the various dialects of the Malayu

---

<sup>1</sup> *Raffles 1818*, pp.102-103; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> For more on this region, see the entry of ‘Menangkabau’ in *Crawford 1856*, pp.273-276.

<sup>3</sup> Which was testified by their use of alphabets, each of which Raffles apparently ascribed an autochthonous origin (*Raffles 1818*, pp.102-103); alphabets were, as it has been discussed earlier, considered an integrate part of the development of civilization, and as such they could be used a parameter of both the obtained stage of civilization and of its probable origin(s). See also *Crawford 1850* and *Crawford 1867a*, pp.100-102.

<sup>4</sup> For more on the conflicting notions of nation and its implications within this context during late 18<sup>th</sup> and earl 19<sup>th</sup> C. European thought, see *Hudson 1996*.

<sup>5</sup> Although Raffles also recognized a clear racial divide on the Malayan peninsula between the costal Malays and a “race of Caffries, who are occasionally found near the mountains”; the latter, named the “Samang” were being described as being wool-haired. (*Raffles 1818*, pp.107-108) Apart from this, Raffles did not elaborate any further on the topic of the ‘Eastern Negroes’ here, but in a private letter to Marsden from 1806 he wrote more at length about this “woolly-haired race” of “Caffries”; yet, here he stated that “I am not much inclined to think that from *this nation*, or rather *race of men*, much interesting information can be derived, beyond that of their actual existence and extent.” (*Raffles 1835*, Vol.I, pp.18-20)

<sup>6</sup> Without, however, in any manner attempting to discredit Marsden’s assertions; rather Raffles seemed to intimate only a slightly deviating interpretation of Marsden’s results.

tongue” as having “experienced such changes, with respect to the purposes of intercourse, that they may be classed into several languages differing considerably from each other”<sup>1</sup> – Raffles stated that:

“I cannot but consider the *Malayu nation* as *one people*, speaking *one language*, though spread over so wide a space, and preserving their *character and customs* in all the *maritime states* lying between the Sulu seas, and the Southern Ocean, and bounded longitudinally by Sumatra, and the western side of Papua, or New Guinea.”<sup>2</sup>

Thus, despite their wide and scattered spatial distribution, all the Malays belonged to the same people, speaking essentially the same language, and in sum they constituted *one nation*. The linguistic factor not only divided people into different societies, but it also connected dispersed communities into societies. However, even though it facilitated connection across divided spaces, would it still be deemed sufficient to connect these into a nation? Whereas such linguistic affinity may have been perceived as necessary in defining a nation, Raffles did not seem to suggest that it was sufficient: instead he emphasized the importance of the vestiges of a corpus of seemingly shared laws and institutions. Despite local differences, the presence of shared features with the other “more ancient and original inhabitants of the eastern islands”, and a marked Muslim influence, Raffles, nonetheless, maintained that all “the Malay *states* possess several codes of laws, denominated *Undang Undang*, or *Institutions*”; these were characterized by “a general accordance; and, where they differ, it is seldom beyond what situation, superior advantages, and authority, have naturally dictated.”<sup>3</sup> So, despite being politically composed of many different state formations, the Malays still constituted one, coherent nation; they possessed the same corpus of laws and identical political institutions which all testified to their shared origin and common historical heritage. In accounting for their origin Raffles concurred with Leyden in “that they did not exist as a separate and distinct nation until the arrival of the Arabians in the Eastern Seas”.<sup>4</sup> Raffles would later explain the existence of the many different *states* existing within the widely scattered Malay *nation* in a letter addressed to Marsden; this was due to “their generally wandering and predatory life [which] induces them to follow the fortune of a favourite chief and to form themselves into a variety of separate clans.”<sup>5</sup> This habitual inclination could thus account for both their wide geographical dispersion and for their political segmentation, whereas their recent origin and the

---

<sup>1</sup> Raffles here referred to what Marsden had written in 1793 (in *Marsden 1798*, pp.227-228); despite some ambiguity in the phrasing it seems much more likely, though, that Marsden here referred to the widely extended language family (i.e. Polynesian or Malayo-Polynesian), rather than to the Malay in the narrower sense that Raffles here assumed. It seems, however, that Raffles did not heed these discrepant applicative scopes in the meaning of the term Malay.

<sup>2</sup> Both this and the quote immediately above are from *Raffles 1818*, p.103. My italics.

<sup>3</sup> All the quotations are from *Raffles 1818*, p.103. The italics in ‘state’ are mine.

<sup>4</sup> *Raffles 1818*, p.127.

<sup>5</sup> Letter from Raffles to Marsden dated Jan 1<sup>st</sup>, 1815 and reprinted in *raffles 1835*, Vol.I, pp.257-266; this quotation is from p.258.

continued interaction between the different states would tend to impede, or at least dilute, the linguistic and cultural segmentation that Marsden stressed within his genealogical framework.

The same motives seemed to be at play in 1821, in his publication of the late Leyden's "Malay Annals" and in the "Introduction" that he wrote to this. A. Reid thus argued that the mere choice of title, "Malay Annals" ("Sejarah Melayu"), rather than its original title which was "The Rule of all Rajahs"<sup>1</sup> shifted the emphasis from primarily presenting a *dynastic chronicle* within the Malay context to instead narrating the *history of a people*. This notion of a people with a distinct, shared history equated that of a *nation*; and, through the almost imperceptible discursive slippages that characterised these discourses, this would then rather effortlessly become the history of a *race*.<sup>2</sup>

Raffles was undeniably an indefatigable amateur scientist and a great political visionary whose feats were almost as cheered in his own day as they were celebrated later when he came to be represented in a hagiographic light, as the illustrious forerunner of both free trade and the Victorian imperialism in Southeast Asia. However, he was hardly an original thinker. His best known scholarly work, "The History of Java" (HJ), was thus, to a much larger degree than usually recognized, chiefly a work of compilation – based, as it was, upon the collections, descriptions, and interpretations facilitated by other scholarly inclined officers and civil servants under his command.<sup>3</sup> The eulogizing tendency in the subsequent history of reception has often prevented historians from recognizing that Raffles's reputation was not at all made before 1811, and it was probably not before the publication of HJ in 1817 that he was renowned in the metropolis as a great scholar too. It was his premature demise in 1826 that allowed him to enter the Parthenon of the early deceased icons: of those whose (imagined) potential forever will outshine the poorer accomplishments of those who lived on to both experience their share of successes and setbacks, their moments of infinite glory and of despairing disappointment.

Yet before that time, Raffles was, rather than setting the scholarly standards, one of those who followed the authority of already established leaders in the field. Thus it should hardly be surprising

---

<sup>1</sup> Or, as mentioned before, "The Genealogy of Kings", as it was translated to by Andaya. (Andaya 2008, p.251)

<sup>2</sup> Reid 2001, 303. See also Raffles 1821, esp. p.v.

<sup>3</sup> In this assessment I am more on par with e.g. Aljunied's evaluation ("Using information derived from Dutch scholars and his contemporaries, such as Colin Mackenzie and John Crawfurd, Raffles was ready to furnish the British public with his own interpretations", Aljunied 2005, p.33) than with Wurtzburg's more traditional and somewhat panegyric verdict that "perhaps no other book in any language had covered such a wide field with such a wealth of first-hand information." (Wurtzburg, p.418) Kindred, or even more hagiographic, descriptions can be found in most of the biographies written on Raffles during the era of high imperialism and the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. (see e.g. Egerton, p.137, Cook 1918, p.3, and Coupland, pp.69-70; even E. Hahn intimated that most of the collecting of [first-hand] information was done by Raffles himself – in Hahn, pp.346-348). These all stressed the aspect of 'first-hand information'; this was not entirely untrue, yet most of this information was not obtained first-hand by Raffles himself, but by the many other Britons and Dutchmen whose researches had been facilitated by Raffles who then acted as a compiler and organizer. On the observations, surveys, and collecting during which this first-hand information was procured, see e.g. Carey 1978, Carey 1979 and Marrison (On in particular Crawfurd's collecting of manuscripts); Weatherbee and Kouznetsova (on especially Mackenzie's collections); and Tiffin 2008 and Tiffin 2009 on the observations and surveys of the temple ruins on Java.

that Raffles as late as in 1815 – in his “Annual Discourse” delivered before the members of the Batavian Society<sup>1</sup> on Sep.11, 1815 – endeavoured to be complacent towards both his late, intellectual Nestor, Leyden,<sup>2</sup> and to the recognized metropolitan doyen of the field, Marsden, with whom he had corresponded on these matters since 1806; a correspondence which would continue right up to his death.<sup>3</sup> In discussing the more remote origins of the Malays, he thus first consented with “the position maintained by Mr. Marsden”:

“that the Malayan [language] is a branch or dialect of the widely extended language prevailing through the islands of the Archipelago, to which it gives name, as well as those of the South Sea, appears to be well established, and confirmed as our information advances”.<sup>4</sup>

Then, after this de facto rejection of Leyden’s refutation of Marsden’s grand theory, Raffles continued the sentence with what appeared to be a concession to Leyden; he here attempted to re-establish the essential connection between the Indo-Chinese and inhabitants of the Malay Archipelago. This time, however, it was not defined by language but based on a racial criterion:

“and, if we except the Papuas and the scattered tribes having curled hair, we find the general description given of the persons of the Siamese and the ruder population of the adjacent countries which have not admitted any considerable admixture from the Chinese, to come very near to the inhabitants of the Archipelago, who may in fact be said to differ only in being of a smaller size, and in as far as foreign colonization and intercourse may have changed them.”<sup>5</sup>

Thus, by subtle alterations in the rhetorical invocations of language, civilization, nation, and even race, Raffles managed to shift almost seamlessly between the fundamentally divergent views held by the two foremost British authorities in this field. These rhetorical quibbles serve, I think, as

---

<sup>1</sup> After Raffles had ‘resuscitated’ the Batavian Society, Marsden became one of only a handful of “Honorary and Corresponding Members” (*Marsden 1838*, p.145); these also included Joseph Banks, William Milburn (the author of “Oriental Commerce”), and Linnaeus’s pupil, the famed botanist who had travelled in both Java and Japan, Carl Peter Thunberg. (List of members printed in the Transactions of the Batavian Society, Vol.VII (1814) and Vol.VIII (1816); see also *Groot*, pp.167-183)

<sup>2</sup> After their first meeting in Penang in 1806 which resulted in the formation of a profound friendship, they met again in Calcutta in 1809-1810 as well as during the invasion of Java in 1811. (See *Wurtzburg*, esp. pp.35-39 and 105-107) During their separation they continued a prolonged correspondence which in particular dealt with topics related to the Eastern Seas and to the Malays. (*Raffles 1835*, Vol.I, pp.26-27)

<sup>3</sup> Mentioned in *Raffles 1835*, Vol.I, p.16. Wurtzburg characterized it as a relationship “from which Marsden obtained, as he publicly acknowledged, a great deal of valuable information. Raffles, in his turn, derived a great advantage also; it acted as a stimulant to his zeal for the studies he had begun from natural curiosity, and which Leyden had encouraged and probably in some degree directed in their earlier stages.” (*Wurtzburg*, p.42) Besides being a stimulant, this connection certainly also imbued Raffles’s own writings with an authorial air that they otherwise hardly would possess. As E. Hahn put it: “Raffles in everything he did was a bit of a politician”. (*Hahn*, p.346)

<sup>4</sup> *Raffles 1816*, pp.72-73.

<sup>5</sup> *Raffles 1816*, p.73. He would reiterate this stance in 1822, in the review of Crawford’s HIA which he wrote with Sir John Barrow; here they spoke of “the striking resemblance that exists between these different nations, and the strong ground derived from physical appearance to conclude a similarity of origin between the islanders and their continental neighbours.” (*Raffles & Barrow*, pp.116-117)

an apt illustration of the plasticity of these terms – not only of their conceptual content but also of their overlapping, entwined, and at times contradictory discursive span.

### 1.2.6 Marsden on the Seat of Origin of the Malay Nation and Language.

Wary of not calumniating a deceased intellectual and imperial hero too severely, Marsden, nonetheless, found it necessary in 1812 to emphasize what in his view appeared to be fundamental flaws in Leyden's account of the composition of the Malayan language, its origin and diffusion.<sup>1</sup> Although both of them concurred in ascribing language a methodological as well as a theoretical primacy, they differed both in their modes of application and in their interpretations.

In the review brought in the *Edinburgh Review* of Leyden's article on "The Languages and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations", another Orientalist, Alexander Hamilton, had stressed both of these aspects: "it is not solely in a philological view, that the study of languages is interesting. They afford us *the surest and most imperishable guide* to the history of the nations who speak them, when their monuments are deficient."<sup>2</sup> Hamilton illustrated this with the allegedly analogical example of the Turks who:

"have long since lost their Tartar configuration:<sup>3</sup> the flat face and squat bodies of their ancestors are no longer remarked amongst their descendants, and have been succeeded by the fine forms which afforded models to Grecian artists. But *their language remains an indelible monument of their origin; and whilst it continues to be spoken, will attest their descent from a tribe of Turcomans.*"<sup>4</sup>

Clearly, what was deemed of most importance here was not the biological, or racial, ties in any narrow sense; primacy should, instead, be attributed to the handing down of civilization and to its implied notion of cultural continuity.<sup>5</sup> Notwithstanding whether the "configuration" of the Turks had changed over time due to intermixture with other nations, or whether the principal cause should be attributed to the shift in environment when they migrated from the Asian steppe to the Anatolian highlands and beyond, the defining core of this people, *as a nation of historical significance*, was

---

<sup>1</sup> For examples of how Marsden, usually in a very polite manner, corrected what he perceived as Leyden's errors or misinterpretations, see *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, pp.ix, xxix-xxx, xxxix, and xlvii. On p.viii he enlarged upon their somewhat strained relation: "The untimely and unfortunate loss of its ingenious author [i.e. Leyden], under circumstances the most favourable for the prosecution of his inquiries, I deeply regret, and the more pointedly I feel myself called upon, in defence of my own, to question the correctness of several of his opinions that appear to have been too hastily adopted, and which I wished him to have brought to the test of local knowledge."

<sup>2</sup> *Hamilton 1810*, p.390; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. the physiological, racial traits.

<sup>4</sup> *Hamilton 1810*, p.390; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> Even though the terms *race* and *nation* were vague, diffuse, and often overlapping, if not outright identical, during this period, N. Hudson has also emphasised how the notion of *nation* gradually gained a new meaning throughout this period; this "emergent concept of 'nation' as a linguistic and cultural community" then continued to be "of considerable importance to the concurrent rise of a racial worldview." (*Hudson 1996*, p.256)



contained in the kind of lineage that could be traced through language rather than in a direct bloodline per se. Even when these were considered identical, language was still deemed a more reliable indicator of the bloodline than the physiognomy was.<sup>1</sup> Only in the most ‘flagrant instances’, as in the case of the ‘Eastern Negroes–Malays’ divide,<sup>2</sup> would an overt racial distinction attain a paramount importance. Here this indeed happened to such a degree that it implied a complete omission of the languages spoken by these Eastern Negroes<sup>3</sup> from the comparative framework; they were hence a priori deemed irrelevant for the study of Malay. It was not until Crawford’s article from 1834 that this approach gradually began to be questioned.<sup>4</sup>

Even though they were operating within roughly similar conceptual frameworks, Marsden’s ideas regarding 1) the composition and origin of the Malay language and 2) what Malayness essentially represented differed considerably from Leyden’s notions. Marsden had been the first to prove the profound influence of the Indian languages, and especially of Sanskrit, upon the Malay language and the framing of its civilization.<sup>5</sup> Yet Marsden’s genealogical approach had imbued him with a methodological predisposition to prioritise the questions regarding origin over those concerning the processes of cultural hybridisation and the accompanying growth of civilization, notwithstanding the crucial importance which he had also allotted to these.<sup>6</sup> Central to his research was hence the search for *a seat of origin*, in terms of time as well as location. Although Malay functioned as a lingua franca in most of the Archipelago, and although the Malays had populated a substantial part of its coastal fringes, both the language and the people necessarily had to have originated somewhere, at specific period of time. In this essentialist approach, language and *nation* appeared as two sides of the same coin; meanwhile the use of the Malay language as a means of cross-cultural communication, i.e. as a lingua franca, seemed to entail a notion of a larger sphere of Malay *civilization* that stretched beyond these narrower national boundaries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Apart from assumptions of indicating lineage, “enquiries into skin colour”, as Stock describes, “hinged on the relationship between inhabitants’ temperament, disposition and bodily humours, and external factors such as climate, commerce, and societal development. In this way, environment, mental faculties, and bodily appearance were coupled in a ‘symbiotic relationship’.” (Stock, p.5) See also e.g. Malik, p.80, or Kidd 2006, p.135.

<sup>2</sup> Which seemed not to have been questioned seriously by any of the protagonists during this period.

<sup>3</sup> As it has been discussed more at length in the last chapter of Part I.

<sup>4</sup> Apart from the short article by Crawford (Crawford 1817b) not much was written in English on this particular topic before 1834. It did, however, compose an integrated part of the analysis in e.g. HIA, in Prichard 1813, pp.256-280, and in Prichard 1826, Vol.I, pp.370-411 (just as it would continue to do in Prichard’s later writings). Klaproth had also published an article on this in French in 1833, and Latham would later lecture on their languages in 1843 (in Latham 1844), before G.W. Earl dedicated an entire monograph to the topic in 1853.

<sup>5</sup> As he here again discussed at length and with the explicit intent of offering a rebuttal of Leyden’s hypothesis and its theoretical foundations, in Marsden 1812, Vol.I, pp.xxii-xxxiii.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Marsden 1812, Vol.I, pp.xviii-xxii.

Acknowledging that “the appellation of Malayu is given in common to both the people and the language”,<sup>1</sup> Marsden had dismissed all speculations about tracing an ultimate origin of the ‘indigenous’ part of the *Malay language* when interpreted in the broadest sense of this term (i.e. as equivalent to *Polynesian* in Marsden’s interpretation of this term):

“But whatever pretensions any particular spot may have to precedence in this respect, the so wide dissemination of a language common to all, *bespeaks a high degree of antiquity, and gives a claim to originality as far as we can venture to apply that term*, which signifies no more than the state beyond which we have not the means, either historically or by fair inference, of tracing the origin. *In this restricted sense it is that we are justified in considering the main portion of the Malayan as original or indigenous*; its affinity to any continental tongue not having yet been shewn; and least of all we can suppose it connected with the monosyllabic or Indo-Chinese, with which it has been classed.”<sup>2</sup>

The last assertion was obviously intended as a refutation of Leyden’s core theory – viz. that of the existence of an Indo-Chinese group of languages to which the polysyllabic languages of the Archipelago, including Malay, also pertained!<sup>3</sup> Regarding the origin of the of the people who went by the denomination of Malays – and, as a corollary, the language that they spoke, viz. *Malay in the narrow sense of the term* – Marsden proved less reluctant in offering his opinion, albeit his discourse, as usual, was replete with methodological reservations and expressions of doubt.

Having described the [Malayan] language as confined in general to the seacoasts of those countries where it is spoken, and consequently as that of settlers or traders, *we are naturally led to inquire in what particular country it is indigenous*, and from whence it has extended itself throughout the archipelago. Many difficulties will be found to attend the solution of this question, *partly occasioned by the bias of received opinions*, grounded on the plausible opinions of those who have written on the subject, and partly from the want of discriminating between [1] *the country from whence the language may be presumed to have originally proceeded*, and [2] *that country from whence, at a subsequent period, numerous colonies and commercial adventurers issuing, widely diffused it amongst the islands*.”<sup>4</sup>

It short, Marsden et al’s argumentative modes consisted of a complex blend of evidence furnished not merely by the study of language itself, but also deriving from racial and geographical considerations, as well as involving antiquarian and historical material. Marsden had before 1811 been inclined to locate the original abode of the Malay nation somewhere on the peninsula with

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden 1812, Vol.I, p.xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Marsden 1812, Vol.I, pp.xx-xxi; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Leyden 1811, pp.161-163.

<sup>4</sup> Marsden 1812, Vol.I, p.iv; my italics.

which they shared their name.<sup>1</sup> Despite disagreeing on what the term *Malay* basically meant, Leyden had expressed a similar opinion regarding the location from whence the (compound) Malay nation and its (hybridized) language originated; in addition to the etymological argument – that the Malays originally stemmed from the land that still carried their name, and which most probably was “the bias of received opinions” referred to by Marsden in 1812 – Leyden also launched what may be called an aesthetic-linguistic argument in favour of locating the site of origin of the Malayan nation there. It was thus here that, according to Leyden, “as a spoken language, the Malayu exists in the *greatest purity*”;<sup>2</sup> notwithstanding whatever criteria he may have relied on in establishing this fact, the implication was evidently that ‘pure’ meant unadulterated in the sense of not being corrupted by a pernicious intermixture with other languages, and thence the location where the *purest* Malay prevailed would also most probably be its place of origin.<sup>3</sup>

When Marsden published the 3<sup>rd</sup>, thoroughly updated edition of his HS in 1811 he had, however, abandoned this interpretation. Still acknowledging that the more recent, and within their own literature well-attested, migrations had emanated from the settlements on the Malayan peninsula,<sup>4</sup> he had, however, by now reversed his view on the location from whence the speakers of Malay *originally* came.

“It has hitherto been considered as an obvious truth, and admitted without examination, that wherever they [i.e. the Malays] are found upon the numerous islands forming this archipelago, they, or their ancestors, must have migrated from the country named by the Europeans (and by them alone) the Malayan peninsula or peninsula of Malacca, of which the indigenous and proper inhabitants were understood to be Malays ... It will, however, appear from the authorities I shall produce, amounting as nearly to positive evidence as the nature of the subject will admit, that the present possessors of the coasts of the peninsula were, on the contrary, in the first instance adventurers from Sumatra, who, in the twelfth century, formed an establishment there”.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden had thus rather cursively, and without further explanation, stated that “the Malay language, which is *original in the peninsula of Malayo*, and has from thence extended itself throughout the eastern islands, so as to become the lingua franca of that part of the globe”. (*Marsden 1784*, p.159; my italics)

<sup>2</sup> *Leyden 1811*, p.164; my italics. See also pp.164-166. In *Marsden 1784*, it was likewise claimed that “the purest, or *most esteemed*, Malay is said, and with great appearance of reason, to be spoken at Malacca”. (p.161; my italics)

<sup>3</sup> Leyden would, however, later in the text clarify somewhat what he meant by *purity* in this context: “It may also be observed that the more mixed and impure any dialect of Malayu is, it is more verbose, more indefinite in its expressions, and more loaded with useless auxiliaries, and epithets, which encumber the language, without adding either elegance, force, or dignity. The beauty and elegance of the Malayu is its simplicity; and the purity of its minor dialects may be ascertained by this criterion alone.” (*Leyden 1811*, p.175)

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.iv.

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1811*, pp.325-326.

The decisive evidence offered by Marsden in support of this changed interpretation was initially found in two Malayan narratives;<sup>1</sup> Marsden had never had any direct access to these two manuscripts; instead he relied on the second-hand knowledge of these that he could obtain from the Dutch orientalist, Petrus van der Worm from the late 17<sup>th</sup> C. (and later reproduced by Valentyn<sup>2</sup>) and G.H. Werndly writing in the early 18<sup>th</sup> C..<sup>3</sup> Despite the rather dubious esteem in which Malayan historiography was held then, Marsden had nonetheless added that “I trust it will not be thought that the mixture of a portion of mythological fable in accounts of this nature, invalidates what might otherwise *have credit as a historical fact.*” When convenient, Malay narratives could apparently be invoked as a historical authority! However, this was followed by a reservation intimating that “the utmost, indeed, we can pretend to ascertain is, what the natives themselves believe to have been their ancient history”.<sup>4</sup> As further proof he then added racial evidence; the Malays were not the only ones inhabiting the peninsula which also contained a group of “indigenous inhabitants, gradually driven by them [the Malays] to the woods and mountains in the interior.”<sup>5</sup> This argument was pursued to further extent the following year: he now emphasised how “subsequent investigation has taught us that in the peninsula itself the Malays were only settlers, and that the interior districts, like those of the islands in general, are inhabited by distinct races of men”.<sup>6</sup> This racial divide between coast and inland was even more pronounced on the peninsula given its population of the primitive, woolly-haired Samang people, and who definitely were considered as both positively unaffiliated with the Malays and as being more original to this location.

If the Malays were not aboriginal to the Malayan peninsula but, on the contrary, came from Sumatra, then Marsden’s next challenge consisted in locating the Sumatran region that could be considered as their seat of origin. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of HS, Marsden identified “the original country inhabited by the Malay race” as “the kingdom of Palembang” in northern Sumatra; in doing so he relied on the information contained these two native manuscripts.<sup>7</sup> The year later he would situate the homeland in the neighbouring highlands of Menangkabau. Leyden had years earlier dismissed this site on account of its dialect not being of pure Malay provenance but, in the contrary, merely a

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden referred to (1) “Taju assalatin” or “Makuta segala raja-raja”, and (2) “Sulalat assalatin” or “penurun-an segala raja-raja”. (*Marsden 1811*, p.326) The latter one we have met before; it was this text that in Leyden’s translation later became known as the “Malay Annals” or “Sejarah Melayu”. The first one appears to be the one that Andaya calls the “Taj al-Salatin”, or the “Mirror of Kings”; this text was written in 1603 by a Bukhari al-Jauhari and served as an ideological underpinning of the emergent power in Aceh. (*Andaya 2008*, p.109)

<sup>2</sup> For more on F. Valentyn (Valentijn) and his magnum opus, see *Graaf*, pp.216-218, and *Coolhaas*, pp.225-226

<sup>3</sup> Marsden himself wrote more extensively on Worm and Werndly and their work in *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, pp.xxxviii, xl, and xlii-xliii. See also *Marsden 1796*, p.72 (on the books he then possessed by Werndly; Petrus van der Worm’s 1708 edition of a “Vocabulaar in’t Duyts ende Malays” does not appear in this book; it is mentioned, however, in *Marsden 1827*, p.234. See also Leyden’s discussion of these in *Leyden 1811*, pp.184-185.

<sup>4</sup> Both are from *Marsden 1811*, p.327; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1811*, p.326.

<sup>6</sup> *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, pp.iv-v.

<sup>7</sup> All these references are from *Marsden 1811*, p.327.

mixed dialect, containing many elements of Javanese.<sup>1</sup> In his argumentation for establishing Menangkabau as the location where the Malay nation and language originated, Marsden invoked a whole series of different kinds of evidence. 1) As an illustration of the general esteem in which this region was held amongst all Malays, Marsden used his antiquarian knowledge<sup>2</sup> and referred to how “its ruins is the object of superstitious veneration” of the kind usually associated with ancient abodes.<sup>3</sup> 2) It seemed to be the only part of the island where no other ethnicities but Malays were known ever to have existed, and 3) Malay appeared to be the only language ever spoken there; 4) this was further corroborated by the absence of any native traditions pointing to this region “having ever been inhabited by any other race.” 5) This negative evidence was then contrasted with positive evidence taken from the Menangkabau tradition that stressed “the notion of their own originality” by commencing “their own national history with an account of Noah’s flood, and the disembarkation of certain persons from the Ark, at a place between the mouths of Palembang and Jambi rivers, who were their lineal ancestors.”<sup>4</sup> In sum, all this would hardly constitute more than circumstantial evidence, even though the sheer bulk here amassed carried some momentum in itself; yet Marsden intended to ram his argument finally home by coupling this array of diverse, non-textual evidence with that adduced from 6) “the authority of native historians” contained in the two Malay manuscripts that he had already referred to the year before. This led him to the conclusion that: “From such a *Malayan country rather than from any maritime establishments*, which always bear the stamp of colonization, we might be justified in presuming the Malays of other parts to have proceeded in the first instance”.<sup>5</sup>

### 1.2.7 Crawford’s Earliest Discourse of the Malays: a Maritime Civilization?

These questions regarding the original homeland of the Malays would resurface in some of the reviews of Marsden’s publications from 1811 and 1812;<sup>6</sup> especially the two lengthy ones in the *Edinburgh Review* would address these issues at depth. These are of particular interest in this context since they most probably were the first texts that a young John Crawford published.<sup>7</sup> They thus inaugurated a literary career that in time would establish him as the authority upon whom the

<sup>1</sup> *Leyden 1811*, p.165. See *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.ix for a refutation of this assertion.

<sup>2</sup> For more on the ‘archaeological’ dimension of the antiquarian researches in the region during this period, see *Diaz-Andreu*, pp.215-222 & 239-240; *Ray 2007*, pp.7-10, and the two articles by S. Tiffin.

<sup>3</sup> See also chapter 3 in *Andaya 2008* (pp.82-107) for a recent assessment of this question.

<sup>4</sup> *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.vi. The references to Noah and the Flood contained in the latter part of the argument would obviously have been parts of the cultural heritage that followed from the introduction of Islam.

<sup>5</sup> *Marsden 1812*, Vol.I, p.vii; my italics.

<sup>6</sup> The Grammar and Dictionary was reviewed in 1812 in the *Literary Panorama* (Vol.XI, pp.208-212); both the *London Review* (Vol.59, 1811, pp.120-26) and the *Eclectic Review* (Vol.VIII:No.1, 1812, pp.290-295) contained longer reviews of the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of HS.

<sup>7</sup> Although the first article, “Publications Respecting the Eastern Peninsula of India”, was ostensibly a review of three books dealing with Southeast Asia, and of which HS was one, the article only dedicated its last three pages to Marsden’s book (*Crawford 1814a*, pp.360-363); the rest focussed on continental Southeast Asia.

Edinburgh Review relied when it came to Southeast Asian matters; before the publication of HIA in 1820, Crawford would thus publish another 3 lengthy articles on these topics in this venue.<sup>1</sup>

Before attaining a position of authority, however, Crawford's first articles were heavily shortened and re-edited by someone at home in Edinburgh; during the year 1814 Crawford occupied various posts of importance on Java,<sup>2</sup> and it was from here that he wrote his drafts to these articles. As we have already seen, a draft version of the article on the "History and Languages of the Indian Islands" (containing a review of Marsden's Grammar and Dictionary) still exists;<sup>3</sup> it offers us a unique opportunity to compare the two versions and thus catch a glimpse of what the editor in Edinburgh, who may very well have been Alexander Hamilton,<sup>4</sup> deemed fit for publication and what was not considered essential. The discrepancy between the published and the manuscript versions was particularly enounced in the parts that deal with the questions regarding the origin of the Malay language and nation. Notwithstanding whether this discrepancy primarily was a result of divergent opinions held by author and editor, or it was merely a question of abbreviating a lengthy, speculative text, these differences nonetheless appear illuminative of two contrasting approaches to these topics.

Anthony Reid has remarked that both Marsden and Crawford found the appellation the *Malay peninsula* puzzling "since they wanted to see a single origin-place for the 'the Malay race', and were equally convinced that it was to be found not in the Peninsula but in Minangkabau."<sup>5</sup> Marsden, as we have already seen, did not reach this conclusion at first; nor did Crawford. The printed article on the "Publications Respecting the Eastern Peninsula of India" merely stated that "from what

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Crawford 1817a*, *Crawford 1818* (although primarily dealing with China it also referred to Southeast Asian topics – two by then quite connected topics, as recently argued by U. Hillemann; the British encounter with China and the Chinese occurred in three different venues: along the border between India and China in the context of the Gurkha wars, in the trade emporium of Canton, and in governing the considerable and steadily growing number of Chinese migrants in Southeast Asia; *Hillemann*, esp. chapter 4, pp.106-149), and in *Crawford 1819*.

<sup>2</sup> For the whereabouts of Crawford and the official functions he had on Java and his missions to other islands, 1811-1816, see especially the scattered information in *Carey 2008*, chapter 7-8 (pp.265-430) and in *Wurtzburg*.

<sup>3</sup> The draft version is to be found in the Mackenzie Private Collection; European Miscellanies (Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1, pp.1-75). In his commentaries to the documents in this collection, C.O. Blagden wrote: "Printed (with some considerable verbal variations, omissions, &c.) in the *Edinburgh Review* (1814), Vol.XXIII, No.XLV, pp.151-189. This essay (which is a review of Marsden's dictionary, as well as his grammar), though by no means free from errors and in many respects superseded by more recent work, would be worth reprinting.... Probably the author was John Crawford. There are some additional notes, probably added by Mackenzie." (*Blagden*, p.245)

<sup>4</sup> According to the *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900 I* (1966, p.452) the authorship to this article should either be ascribed to Alexander Hamilton or possibly to John Crawford; but it does not figure in the listing of Crawford's articles in the Vol.5 1989, p.188. The longer, original manuscripts to this article still existent in IOR seem quite evidently to be attributable to Crawford's pen. The question, then, remains whether it was A. Hamilton who back in Edinburgh edited this rough draft? I have not found any evidence which contradicts this assumption, and internal evidence in the article appear to concur with Hamilton's earlier published ideas on these topics; furthermore, the article refers to Hamilton's earlier review of Leyden's article (*Hamilton's article 1810*) as "our review of Dr. Leyden's essay" (*Crawford 1814b*, p.172); "our" could here of course also merely refer to the venue of publication – i.e. the ER.

<sup>5</sup> *Reid 2001*, p.304.

country they [the Malays] *originally* sprung, or to what causes their dispersion is to be ascribed, remains among the secrets of Oriental history.”<sup>1</sup>

Although Crawford by 1820 would claim that “the country of Menangkabau in Sumatra is, however, beyond dispute, the parent country of the Malay *race*”,<sup>2</sup> the two versions of the “History and Languages of the Indian Islands”, offered two other, entirely different interpretations. The published version concluded that there are “many grounds for believing that that the Peninsula of Malacca was the cradle of that extraordinary people [viz. the Malays]”<sup>3</sup> Even though the author(s) expressed a reservation toward the historical credibility of the content of the Malay historical narratives, the article nevertheless professed “to be of opinion, that the old and generally received notion of the Peninsula being the cradle of the Malay *tribes*, is supported by evidence, at least as strong as the contrary conclusion of Mr. Marsden”.<sup>4</sup> Apart from offering a detailed refutation of Marsden’s arguments in favour of locating the origin of the Malay nation and language in Menangkabau,<sup>5</sup> the article also questioned “Mr. Marsden’s definition of the term Malayu”.<sup>6</sup> It thus claimed that Marsden conflated the existence of a term with the positive content of a concept.

“That the *scattered tribes* of various and distant countries, *possessing separate governments*, and distinct interests, should not, though *speaking one language*, be recognized among themselves by one name, will not appear extraordinary. In fact, we know, that under such circumstances, *each tribe assumes a different appellation*. But the more civilized people in their neighbourhood will infallibly give *one name to the whole swarm of savages*”.<sup>7</sup>

Sharing the same appellation did not necessarily imply that the people thus denominated shared the same history and essential cultural traits, and hence belonged to the same nation. Instead, Malay seemed to be a generic term, originally bestowed by the sedentary and more civilized Javanese upon all the marauding, and in their view savage, tribes who roamed their shores. In short, *Malayness* was originally negatively defined: it referred to all the intrusive, surrounding savages who possessed none of those marks of civilization of which the Javanese prided themselves. As such it was neither *race* nor *nation* but the idea of (absent) *civilization* that had framed the notion of Malay and then attributed it to all the coastal tribes and embryonic state-formations. What was cast into doubt here was thus the very essence of Marsden’s explanative mode and the narrative it facilitated – the narrative of how the Malay nation went from being originally land-based to subsequently epitomize a maritime way of life, scattered along the littoral throughout the whole Archipelago.

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1814a, p.361; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> HIA, Vol.II, pp.371-372; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1814b, p.164.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1814b, p.158; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> As offered on pp.158-166 in Crawford 1814b.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1814b, p.160.

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1814b, p.160; my italics.

“We cannot, for example, help considering it as most improbable that an inland people, attached to the soil, and acquainted with agriculture, as the people of Menangkabau evidently were, should, in a country where there was still abundance of unoccupied land, at once change their habits, and undertake a foreign and maritime migration.”<sup>1</sup> Unless it could be positively proved, such a narrative based on a retrograde dynamic in terms of civilization<sup>2</sup> would appear unconvincing; in the civilization orientated view of the author(s) of this article, the burden of explanation unequivocally befell upon the account that deviated from a *naturalised* perception of the progress of civilization.

This insistence of the Malay peninsula being the original seat of the Malays was not as pronounced in the draft version as it was in the printed article. The manuscript concentrated more on the fact that the Malay *civilization* appeared to be a purely maritime one; it took much pains at explaining the particular process through which such a maritime civilization could emerge and in time reach a relative high level without being as reliant upon agriculture as the theory of progress usually prescribed. In a rather didactical manner, Crawford then provided a model discourse based on conjectural history in which this singular instance of a maritime civilization was explained by solely relying on the standard, law-abiding patterns of civilizational progress.

“In a country thus situated it will not be difficult to conjecture what mode of existence would be most natural to its first inhabitants. *The hungry savage* would choose those situations and that manner of life in which he could most easily procure the means of satisfying the first and most urgent calls of nature. To his seas & rivers he would naturally have recourse for that supply which his forests denied him, & *consequently his first stage of civil existence would be that of the fisherman & not of the hunter.*

The supply of food procured in that manner is generally more ample & permanent than by means of the chase, & indicates superior comfort & improvement. When however by the natural progress of things the numbers of such a society increased, the rude art which sufficed to procure subsistence for a few would become inadequate. The ingenuity of its members would be exercised to augment the supply of food, & *not the plough but the net, the canoe hollowed from the trunk of a tree, ultimately the oar, the sail & the more improved*

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1814b, p.159.

<sup>2</sup> Given that it implied an abandonment of agriculture in favour of a more roving way of life, resembling that of the pastoralists on land! According to theory, this should precede, not proceed from-, the agricultural stage of civilization. Yet, this is exactly what recent researches have argued actually happened in the ‘ethnic formation’ of the maritime based *Orang Laut* and the forest dwelling *Orang Asli*, as pointing to two groups of people in the region who left agriculture in favour of a roaming life at sea or in the interior. In doing so, they played a “distinct, complementary economic role” in the region which benefited both them and the more sedentary societies, rather than representing either the most primitive level from which the Malays later evolved, or being a pursued minority who, to their own distress, were dispossessed and forced to live on the margins of society as a last resort before extinction, such as Crawford et al would later claim! (See e.g. Andaya 2008, pp.173-234 and Sather)



*vessel would be first inventions of mankind.*<sup>1</sup> The pursuits of the fisherman are akin to those of the mariner, & the skill & intrepidity at first necessary to procure a subsistence would ultimately be the parents of that enterprise which would urge the *savage to attempt the ocean and visit foreign countries*. Such appears to us to have been *the probable origin of the Malay tribes*,<sup>2</sup> & such an account agrees with all we know of them, while it explains many otherwise inexplicable circumstances in their history & manners.

But when the population began still further to press upon the means of subsistence, the habits they had formed, the vicinity of many countries similar to their own, & which *to men little connected with the soil would hardly appear foreign land naturally induce them to emigrate*. The habits already formed,<sup>3</sup> an ignorance of the pursuits of agriculture<sup>4</sup> & perhaps the natural sterility of the soil would deter them from attempting to procure from the soil the necessary supply of food. Men who do not till the soil readily undertake such migrations & *are indeed little attached to any country*. They soon acquire a roving and predatory disposition which delights in war & enterprise. *Such is the known character of the Malays. It bears in this respect a striking resemblance to that of the Nations of the North of Europe when similarly situated, ...is it that in the most distant & dissimilar climates the manners of mankind under similar circumstances assume nearly the same character & appearance.*

By adverting to the causes & circumstances now stated it will be no difficult matter to account for the present appearance of the *Malay tribes*, scattered in small communities over the coasts of the East insular regions, yet preserving notwithstanding their distance an extraordinary uniformity of manners. Had, we may presume, any of the lands in which they settled been of great fertility, or had their migrations been repressed by a scarcity of new

---

<sup>1</sup> This focus on how progress of civilization manifested itself in the maritime pursuits would later resurface in Crawford's discourse; commenting on the history of trade in the Indian Archipelago, Crawford stated that: "the state of the arts of shipbuilding and navigation among nations affords us at once an *easy and certain criterion to judge their comparative civilization and barbarism*." (HIA, Vol.III, pp.172-179; the quotation is from p.173. My italics) In *Crawford 1828a*, pp.48-52 he further discussed the characteristics of Chinese shipbuilding and navigation in a comparative, civilizational framework. This theme would be taken up again by a later generation of British colonial scholar-administrators and anthropologists in this region; during the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> C. both the scholar-administrator James Hornell and anthropologist Alfred C. Haddon wrote extensively on primitive seafaring and especially the vessels in this region; in collaboration they published their "Canoes of Oceania" (3 vols., 1936-1938). It was common for both to inscribe this research into a larger framework of stadial civilization and, in particular, of racial distribution and an accompanying cultural dissemination. (see e.g. *Haddon*, p.130; *Hornell 1920*, p.110, and *Hornell 1920/2002*, p.7)

<sup>2</sup> That is, a prioritising of the explanations provided by conjectural history in lieu of the apparently positive evidence that Marsden had forwarded in favour of his hypothesis.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford seemed here to suggest a sort of cultural inertia that would have repercussions for the subsequent evolution of each society/nation/people; that is, the location and manner at which the origin happened would be of paramount importance for the later historical trajectory, its possible directions, and the potential that the society possessed. This can be viewed as an attempt at bridging the explanative modes ingrained in the mechanistic philosophical history that characterised Crawford's approach and a Romanticist focus of origin and uniqueness.

<sup>4</sup> Here followed Crawford's own (or, alternatively, Mackenzie's) footnote in the draft: "Rice & the principal mode of cultivating it would appear from the identity of names to be borrowed from the Javanese."

lands or rather perhaps new fishing grounds & rivers, their civil polity would in all probability have assumed a different character & instead of *a people split into a number of petty communities* the Malays would in all likelihood have been under a single head.”<sup>1</sup>

Thus, without any recourse to an assumption of a shared national origin, and rejecting as well the Malay texts as their traditions, Crawford offered a rational explanation of the manner in which the Malayan societies (most) likely could have acquired their specific characteristics. The cultural aspects were thus from the very onset explained by Crawford on a purely materialist basis, and they were inscribed in a discourse governed by a rigidly mechanistic logic which emphasized the universal over the unique. This fundamental discrepancy in the mode of explanation – and hence the implied divergence in approach, interpretive framework, and applied theories – was both a result- and cause of different, competing world views; it had profound implications in the shape of the specific kind of Malayness they generated, and this, again, circumscribed a particular political space of action. Through the idioms that they provided they prefigured what could be thought and done as well as what could not be so.<sup>2</sup>

By first de-naturalising the primordialist notion of a Malay nation<sup>3</sup> and the existence of an original homeland – and then followed by a downplaying of the genealogical approach in favour of a framework focussing on the stadial progression of civilization – Crawford, and perhaps Hamilton too, not only introduced a new theoretical framework into this area of study, but this also implied a revised gaze with which these peoples and their societies were contemplated. With this revised gaze came new agendas as well. Instead of merely looking back into history for the seat from whence a given *nation* originated and then tracing its history, this inherently conservative scheme was now challenged by a fundamentally liberal paradigm; progress substituted origin as the key trope in construing the historical narrative, and this instigated the shift from lineage to civilization as the main theme. Civilization replaced nation as the main component in the shaping of the Malay culture and history, whereas language and, to a lesser degree, race remained the key sources through which ‘data’ could be extracted, framed, and later adduced as historical evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1, pp.29-31; all the italics are mine.

<sup>2</sup> “Commitment to a particular form of knowledge predetermines the kinds of generalizations one can make about the present world, the kinds of knowledge one can have of it, and hence the kinds of projects one can legitimately conceive for changing that present or for maintaining it in its present form indefinitely.” (*White 1973*, p.21)

<sup>3</sup> For an insightful discussion of *primordialism* as an analytical concept and as an ontological entity – as well as the associated notions of linguism, ethnicity, etc. – in South- and Southeast Asian contexts, see *Pollock 2006*, chapter 13 (pp.497-524), and especially pp.505-511. Pollock’s point was that these concepts are, by and large, western constructs that does not reflect any South- or Southeast Asian reality; on the contrary, this “underlying assumption that language or any other kind of primordial sentiment, whether real or factitious, is [a] transhistorical phenomenon” is actually countered by the fact that “the sentimental attachment to language that is ubiquitous in Europe is incommensurable with anything we know about premodern South Asia” (p.508) – as such, a use of these concepts as key analytical tools would invariably imply a theoretical distortion of the studied subject.

### 1.2.8 Beyond the Scholar-Administrators I: Jambulus' Objections.

Quoting prodigiously from both the Introduction to Marsden's Grammar of the Malayan Language and from the review hereof in the Edinburgh Review, Jambulus's privately circulated manuscript sided with Marsden on most points. Jambulus, as it has already been noticed in a previous Part, decried the mockery of the "Malayan historians" contained in the article brought in the Edinburgh Review, and he pleaded for attaching a bigger credibility to "the traditions regarding their origin".<sup>1</sup> Commenting upon Crawford's (and Hamilton's) proposition regarding the true etymology of the term Malayu, Jambulus mused:

"but it may be confidently asserted that the reviewers cannot produce one Javanese who ever dreamt of such a far fetched etymology for the term Malayu, as applied to the *Malayan nation*; the names of places in the Eastern Islands are almost always significant, and if the reviewers could produce any tradition, any voucher for this etymology, *derived from native authority*, the notion might perhaps be entitled to some attention, but it will be found that there exists no tradition whatever to support this idea, while on the contrary there is another etymology,... I allude to the traditions of Perak, Macassar and Boni – and it may not be amiss to give a faint outlook of *the general opinion entertained regarding the origin of the different native establishments in the Indian Archipelago*, as supported by *tradition and native history* - and by the traces of *character*<sup>2</sup>, *language* – and *habits discernable among the different nations at the present day*.<sup>3</sup>

On this foundation Jambulus seemed to accept Marsden's analysis with regard to the origin of the Malayan *nation* and *language*, in as much as it concurred with the traditions held- and written by the Malays themselves. However, he appeared to be more interested in discerning the ultimate origin of societies in this region; these questions – going way beyond the scope of what the native source-material could deliver with any pretence of credibility – begged the introduction of yet other kinds of evidence. In addressing the question of origin of almost the entire *population*,<sup>4</sup> Jambulus claimed that "it may be assumed that the Indian Islands were first peopled from the continent of Asia – and the country lying between the Gulf of Siam and China was in all probability the main land from whence the first settlers emigrated."<sup>5</sup> In support of this hypothesis Jambulus invoked geological, demographic, historical, and linguistic evidence when he argued that "this probability is supported by [1] the antiquity of this part of the continent to the islands, [2] its extensive

---

<sup>1</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, pp.133-134.

<sup>2</sup> "Character" seemed in this context to refer to script – i.e. to letters and alphabets.

<sup>3</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, pp.146-147; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Except "the Semang, or woolly haired race" whom Jambulus, in concordance with the other writers on this topic, seemed to assess as fundamentally distinct from all the other inhabitants in the region and most probably assumed them to be autochthonous too. MSS EUR K239/5, p.158-159. See also *Manickam 2009b* for other contemporary views.

<sup>5</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, pp.147-148.

population, [3] the intimate connection which appears in the earliest time to have existed between the principal states of the archipelago and the countries of Siam, Laos and Champa – [4] the similarity which still exists in many of the customs and usages, and *in the languages of the less civilized tribes* in the Eastern Seas.”<sup>1</sup> Apparently having taken place in times immemorial, this hypothesis would also “account for the *resemblance of the Malay to the Tartar* and the *similarity which is found to exist in all the genuine languages of the Islands* and which is so particularly noticed by Mr. Marsden.”<sup>2</sup> So, in addition to the abovementioned evidence, this would also serve to explain what was perceived as a racial similitude and linguistic affinity throughout the entire region. Whereas he in the latter echoed Marsden’s findings, the former assessment was more in concert with what both Leyden and Raffles had claimed; whether primarily based on language (Leyden) or race (Raffles), this approach emphasised the Indo-Chinese connection over the Oceanic one as representing the most original link between this part and the rest of the world.

Then “the next point is to have from whence these rude and savage tribes received their first marks of *civilization* – whether from Egypt and the colonies established by that power, or at a subsequent period from an Indian country may be matter of doubt”; notwithstanding which of these conjectures that might be preferred, the later impact of Indian traders, not at least on the Malays, seemed to be “established on incontestable evidence.”<sup>3</sup>

But the insistence on the credibility of the content that could be found in the Malays’ own oral traditions and written histories, nevertheless, continued to constitute the most poignantly articulated argument in Jambulus’ discourse which ended by decrying Crawford’s (and Hamilton’s) article in the Edinburgh Review and claiming “that all the reviewers have brought forward against Mr Marsden’s hypothesis as to the country in which the Malay language is indigenous – is vox et praeterea nihil”<sup>4</sup>; that is, an altogether empty discourse, devoid of any substantiated opinions.

### 1.2.9 Beyond the Scholar-Administrators II: John Hunt on the Malays.

As a final example of the intricate interplay between the notions of nation, civilization, culture, and race, as well as the role played by language, in the definition, demarcation, and content of Malayness, I have chosen an article entitled “Annotations and Remarks with a view to Illustrate the Probable Origin of the Dayaks, the Malays, &c.”, first published in Malayan Miscellanies in 1820

<sup>1</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, pp.148; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, pp.148-49; the italics are mine. Jambulus thus posited himself amongst those who opined that the ‘Malayan race’ was either a subgroup of the larger Yellow, Tartar, or Mongol race, or at least very closely affiliated with it; Jambulus and Raffles thus seemed to agree more with Cuvier (and later Wallace) than with Blumenbach who placed the Malay race somewhere between the Ethiopian and the Caucasian. (*Bendyshe-Blumenbach*, p.275; see also *Keevak*, esp. pp.57-82)

<sup>3</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, p.149; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> MSS EUR K239/5, p.184.

but originally written in 1815.<sup>1</sup> Only two volumes of the *Malayan Miscellanies* were printed at the Sumatran Mission Press before Bencoolen was turned over to the Dutch in 1824, as part of the Anglo-Dutch Treaty.<sup>2</sup> As such it seemed to merely be a rather obscure text, published at a peripheral location in a region that after 1816 seemed to have become more marginalised; yet the journal still managed to be reviewed in the *Quarterly Review*, in Barrow's and Raffles's article which also contained the scathing review of Crawford's HIA.<sup>3</sup>

Initially the author was anonymous and only signed himself with the letter H.<sup>4</sup> However, in a reprint of the article – published the following year in the *Asiatic Journal & Monthly Register*, for British India and Its Dependencies – John Hunt was named as its author;<sup>5</sup> internal evidence in the text itself appear to confirm this assertion.<sup>6</sup> John Hunt was a private country trader who, during the British occupation of Java and the other Dutch East Indian provinces, had undertaken various voyages to the outer regions of the Archipelago in a semi-official position; these resulted in the gathering of much needed information,<sup>7</sup> and in the writing of reports which represented an elaborate knowledge production, exhibiting attempts at classification, structured analysis, and tentative synthesis. Best known is probably his “Sketch of Borneo” (1812) which was intended to provide a first-hand insight into the characteristics of that huge island; it could thus serve as a supplement to the last assignment that Leyden undertook before his demise and which bore the same title.<sup>8</sup> Some of these reports were published in the *Malayan Miscellanies*, and they were later reissued – together with Leyden's “Sketch of Borneo” but without “Annotations and Remarks with a view to Illustrate the Probable Origin of the Dayaks, the Malays, &c.” – by J.H. Moor in his “Notices of the Indian Archipelago”, published in Singapore in 1837.

In his “Annotations and Remarks” John Hunt set out to account for origin of the Malays without primarily relying on “that general European test, the affinity of their language to that of some

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hunt 1820a*, p.40.

<sup>2</sup> On this, see e.g. *Wright 1950*; *Irwin 1955*, pp.52-70; and *Tarling 1975* pp.10-27

<sup>3</sup> The inclusion of the *Malayan Miscellanies* here should probably be seen as a result of Raffles's indefatigable lobbying work. Given the very limited number of Europeans at Bencoolen, Raffles could not establish anything of the size of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences during his governorship there from 1818 to 1824, but together with William Jack, a surgeon and naturalist stationed there, he did manage to avail himself of the equipment furnished by the Baptist Mission Press there and to publish the *Malayan Miscellanies*. (*Wurtzburg*, pp.576-577 & 664)

<sup>4</sup> *Hunt 1820a*, p.40.

<sup>5</sup> Printed on pp.29-35 & 117-121.

<sup>6</sup> The author himself refers to his prolonged stay at Borneo two years before the article was written, i.e. 1813, and this corresponds to Hunt's whereabouts at that time. (See *Wurtzburg*, pp.319 & 348-349; *Irwin*, p.26; *Smith 2002*, pp.48-51; and especially *Smith 2007*, pp.110-112)

<sup>7</sup> Apart from going to Pontianak at the western coast of Borneo, Hunt also undertook a semi-diplomatic voyage to the Sulu Archipelago. (*Wurtzburg*, p.319) His report on “Some Particulars Relative to Sulo in the Archipelago in Felicia” was also printed in *Malayan Miscellanies*, Vol.I (and reprinted, with some minor changes in 1837 in *Moor*, Appendix, pp.31-60)

<sup>8</sup> For more on Leyden's article, his principal sources, and its making in *Smith 2004*, pp.48-50. Leyden's article was first printed in the *Transactions of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences*, Vol.VII; it was reprinted with minor changes in 1837 in *Moor*, Appendix, pp.93-109.

continental tongue.”<sup>1</sup> Instead he pleaded that: “wedded to no particular system, I am only solicitous, by calm discussion and dispassionate enquiry, if possible, to attain that grand desideratum, the *truth*.”<sup>2</sup> F.A. Smith undoubtedly was right when he observed that in terms of usable *information* this article “contains little of value”.<sup>3</sup> Yet what renders it of particular interest here is that the ideas on the origin and ethnicity of the Malays were those articulated by a country trader and mariner who explicitly defined himself in opposition to both the erudite scholars back in Europe and the equally enlightened scholar-administrators in the EIC. It demonstrated a wide reading of both old and recent literature on the topic,<sup>4</sup> but it also evinced an unschooled mind with a propensity towards ascribing equal value to all kinds of evidence, whether extracted from apparently shared cultural traits, common racial features, linguistic affinities, seemingly identical aspects of religious observances, or the content of their own traditions. Without methodological discrimination, all these kinds of evidence were inscribed into a genealogical framework where all these features appeared as the outcome of shared origins.<sup>5</sup> However, despite his avowed commitment to a non-theoretical approach, Hunt in the end attributed most importance to the alleged evidence adduced by racial features, by the natives’ own traditions, and in particular by his own, somewhat idiosyncratic, brand of *conjectural etymology*. Based on what he saw as striking resemblances in the proper names of nations and places, and supported by apparent racial identities as well as by their own traditions, Hunt inferred that “the Malays, the Dayaks, the inhabitants of all the Philippines, the Eastern Islands, and the Polynesian Isles are all of *one original race*”.<sup>6</sup> In the case of the Malays the extent of the shared similarities was further emphasised: “the inland people on the Peninsula of Malacca, are *in person, manners, customs, and language, the same* as the Dayaks of Borneo.”<sup>7</sup> On the same evidence he then hypothesised that all the people pertaining to this *race* originally emigrated to this region from the countries on the Indo-Chinese part of the Asian continent; only the Semangs, Papuans, and other tribes of the Eastern Negroes were “the aborigines of all these islands, at least as far as the same has been traced.”<sup>8</sup> Regarding the origin of the Malay – both as nation, language, and probably civilization too – Hunt thus concluded that “Mr. Marsden’s opinion must be considered as

---

<sup>1</sup> Hunt 1820a, p.1.

<sup>2</sup> Hunt 1820a, p.1; the italics are Hunt’s own.

<sup>3</sup> Smith 2007, p.113.

<sup>4</sup> Including references to both Marsden’s older and newest texts, to *Leyden 1810*, *Hamilton 1810*, and *Crawfurd 1814a*.

<sup>5</sup> “In this particular instance, I think the basis is unnecessarily contracted, and that other *corroborating analogies equally striking*, and to the full as conclusive, may be brought forward in aid of an enquiry, as novel as it is dark and intricate.” (Hunt 1820a, p.1)

<sup>6</sup> Hunt 1820a, pp.39-40; my italics. With the exception of these concluding remarks, the ‘Polynesian question’ was absent from the whole article, apart from a single reference to Pinkerton(’s Geography) (p.4); as such, the geographical scope assumed in Hunt’s discourse was more influenced by Leyden’s approach than by Marsden’s.

<sup>7</sup> Hunt 1820a, p.23; my italics.

<sup>8</sup> Hunt 1820a, p.39.

erroneous”.<sup>1</sup> Instead he followed in the interpretive track that Leyden had sketched. In addition to the abovementioned kinds of evidence, Hunt also involved his own extensive first-hand knowledge of the region; he did this, however, without presenting it as a source of increased authority of his assertions. On the contrary, in accounting for the similarities between the inhabitants of Borneo and the Malayan peninsula, Hunt stated that “as the former accounts must be *drawn from my personal observations*, and depend on my sole ipse dixit, I must wave it”.<sup>2</sup> He probably thought that he, in his capacity as a mere country trader and undistinguished “half-caste gentleman”, would not be endowed with sufficient social credibility to be considered trustworthy on par with those authorities with whom he debated.

Even more interesting, perhaps, was Hunt’s reliance on evidence adduced from conjectural etymology. Despite the reservations held by the majority of the philologists towards this field, and the ridicule of its use by uttered e.g. R. Rask and Vans Kennedy,<sup>3</sup> this approach appeared to continue to lure the ‘less schooled’ Orientalists who were keen on basing their arguments on philological evidence – the most prestigious and revered kind of evidence at this period of time.

#### **1.2.10 A Return to Orthodoxy? On the Origin of the Malay Nation and Civilization in HIA.**

The publication of HIA in 1820 has been chosen to end this prolonged *discursive moment*; with this we have introduced the all main actors and the major approaches that would be referred to- and discussed in the years to come. These had, in short, delineated both the geographical and thematic scopes of the field, as well as the contextual space in which it was situated. The texts and contexts discussed above thus provided the interpretive templates that the subsequent debates would invoke, reject, and revise.

Although Crawford continued to employ his own brand of stadial progress as the main theoretical approach to this region, its peoples and their history, his views on the origin of the Malay *nation* had changed substantially since the article he wrote in the Edinburgh Review in 1814. Still focussing more on the progress of civilization than on genealogical descent, the latter aspect had, nevertheless, sneaked its way into Crawford’s narrative; the Malays’ own historical texts<sup>4</sup> had

---

<sup>1</sup> Hunt 1820a, p.23.

<sup>2</sup> Hunt 1820a, p.11.

<sup>3</sup> See Rask, pp.11-55 and Kennedy. Kennedy reserved the use of etymology to only a very narrow field of research, whereas he passed severe strictures on the kind the kind of study that Hunt did here; Kennedy thus quoted Sir W. Jones’s twice: “I beg leave as a philologist to enter my protest *against conjectural etymology in historical researches*, and principally against the licentiousness of etymologists in transposing and inserting letters, in substituting at pleasure any consonant for another, and in totally disregarding the vowels.” (Quoted on p.5 and then again on p.240; my italics)

<sup>4</sup> The almost mandatory reservations Crawford uttered here were, however, only minor: “As the transaction does not pretend to a very remote antiquity, we may credit the universal assertion of the Malays themselves, though it would not be safe to trust to the details which they furnish”. (HIA, Vol.II, p.372) And: “notwithstanding these suspicious circumstances in the detail of events, the main points may be relied upon”. (p.375)

even attained a more prominent place – although this prominence was still only by proxy, through references to the use of these by Marsden and by his sources (Van der Worm and Valentyn).<sup>1</sup> By now Crawford had, by and large, adopted Marsden’s version of the origin of the Malay *nation*, or *race* as he called it.<sup>2</sup> Yet rather than merely copying Marsden’s narrative, Crawford appropriated it, and the explanative modes with which he accounted for the origin and subsequent dissemination of the Malays were purely his own. So, how come that Crawford now had substituted the idea of a purely maritime Malay civilization with the notion of Menangkabau being “beyond dispute, the parent country of the Malay race”? In the words of Crawford himself:

“Menangkabau, contrary to all other Malay states, is an *inland country*... We are at first struck with the improbability of an inland people undertaking a maritime emigration; but their emigration, it will perhaps appear, on a closer examination, may really be ascribed to this peculiarity of situation. *The country which the primitive Malayan race inhabits is described as a great and fertile plain*, well cultivated, and having a frequent and ready communication with the sea, by the largest rivers within the bounds of the Archipelago. The probability, then, is, that a long period of tranquillity, secured by the supremacy which the people of the Menangkabao acquired over the whole island, *occasioned a rapid and unusual start in civilization and population*, – *that the best lands became scarce*, – *and that, in consequence, the swarm which founded Singahpura in the Peninsula, was thrown off*.”<sup>3</sup>

Subsequently, Crawford, in concert with Marsden, opined that: “it was from the colony [on the Malayan peninsula], and not the parent stock, that the *Malayan name and nation were so widely disseminated* over the Archipelago.”<sup>4</sup> Although ascribing a for him rather unusual credibility to the content of the Malayan historical texts, Crawford, in clear contrast to Marsden, continued to rely on an explanative mode that focussed on the allegedly necessary material foundations for the origin and growth of civilization, upon which the conjectures that made up his narrative of progress was primarily based. It was, in other words, the very same logic and kinds of evidence as when he six years before had reached the opposite conclusion: that Malayness had arisen as a product of a maritime civilization that originated along the coastal fringes. What, then, had happened in the meantime? The available empirical data had apparently not changed; yet Crawford’s use and evaluation hereof clearly had.

Perhaps the principal cause for this change was merely the shift in the medium of articulation: a review – and especially in a periodical like the *Edinburgh Review*, with its explicitly formulated

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.373.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford’s use of the term *race* in this context clearly resembled Marsden’s *nation*; for further political and/or cultural subdivisions Crawford here used the term *tribe*. (HIA, Vol.II, pp.371-378)

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.372; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.376; my italics.



ideological agenda – called for an intentionally polemical attitude, and in particular if the author of the review wanted to establish himself as a known character in the field (as Crawford did!). A grand work of synthesis, like the HIA, on the other hand, probably prescribed a more mature style and a mediated stance in such questions as the origin of the Malays! Crawford did not reveal his motives for this change; the only reference to his earlier assessment on the maritime origin of the Malay civilization is vague and only indirect – formed as a counterfactual hypothesis. Crawford mused:

“Had the original tribe consisted of mere fishermen and navigators, their numbers would not have increased so as to give rise to so striking an event in history [i.e. the wide dissemination of the Malays all over the Archipelago]”<sup>1</sup>

Through an invocation of ‘demographic facts’ Crawford now refuted the very possibility of the origin and growth of a maritime Malay civilization akin to “the Nations of the North of Europe when similarly situated”.<sup>2</sup> Instead, he had by now reverted to the standard narrative in conjectural history where civilization grew out of an intensified agriculture, once this could be able to sustain a long distance trade and a more sophisticated form of state formation. This new argument implied a complete reversal of the conclusions drawn from exactly the same premises as six years before! As such, this argumentative oscillation illustrates the kind of methodological opportunism and interpretive licentiousness that at times characterised Crawford’s discourses.

### **1.3 British Discourses on the ‘Madagascar Problem’: A Non-Issue in the 1810s and 1820s.**

The issue of the enigmatic linguistic similarities between distant Madagascar and the Indian/Malayan Archipelago, or Hither Polynesia, was literally marginal to the discourse at this moment. Leyden, and those who followed his theoretical approach, operated with a much more restricted geographical framework, composed chiefly by the Indo-Chinese parts of the Asian continent and by the Indian/Malayan Archipelago (incl. the Philippines). The South Seas and Madagascar hardly figured at all within this framework. Madagascar was here only mentioned when referring to Marsden’s grand theory, but it always fell beyond the analytical scope of these texts; thence the question of linguistic affinity vs. racial difference remained unaddressed by these authors.<sup>3</sup> Apart from its peripheral position in terms of geography, this can probably also be

---

<sup>1</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.373.

<sup>2</sup> Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1, p.30. It will be remembered that Crawford had also in the draft from 1814 ended his argument with a counterfactual hypothesis, the discursive purpose of which – by emphasising the (only possible!) genesis of certain, specific cultural and political traits – was to stress the exact opposite conclusion: that is, *if* any land in which the Malays had settled, or where they may have originated, had been “of great fertility”, *then* “their civil polity would in all probability have assumed a different character & instead of a people split into a number of petty communities the Malays would in all likelihood have been under a single head.” (p.31)

<sup>3</sup> Neither did *Leyden 1799* nor the by Hugh Murray enlarged *Leyden & Murray* contain any references to the population of Madagascar and the discovery of them. Leyden did, however, translate and put into rhyme one of Évariste de Parry’s “Chanson madeçasses” (1787) which was reprinted in *Leyden 1819*, pp.221-222.

interpreted as an indication of the rather marginal discursive role of the concept of a (purely biological) race at this moment of time; the seemingly contradictory nature of linguistic vs. racial evidence epitomized in the black yet Austronesian speaking inhabitants of Madagascar thus appeared much less unsettling then, if it was noticed at all!

### **1.3.1 Marginalising Madagascar in Marsden's Discourse.**

Marsden's publications remained, as customary for his discourse, unperturbedly fixed upon the linguistic aspect, and, besides, none of his publications during these years touched directly upon this topic. Yet nobody would probably have been better equipped than him to address it in depth. Alongside his pioneering work in establishing the existence of a (Malayo-)Polynesian language family and his thorough knowledge of many of these languages, Marsden had also taken up the study of African languages – not at least to determine, as he would later put it, whether the language spoken on Madagascar, where it differs the most from the Polynesian, bear any resemblance to those spoken of the neighbouring coast of Africa.<sup>1</sup>

Again this interest was both spurred- and facilitated by his patron, Sir Joseph Banks, who, through this role in the African Association (founded 1788) and his extensive network, furnished Marsden with the necessary empirical material such as vocabularies, travellers' reports, etc.<sup>2</sup> Although primarily renowned for his study of languages pertaining to the Malayo-Polynesian realm, Marsden also contributed to the studies of African languages with his "Observations of the Language of Siwah", which was attached as an appendix to Frederick Horneman's Journal, and with the recommendations to the study of languages that accompanied the ill-fated Tuckey expedition up the Congo River.<sup>3</sup>

### **1.3.2 Crawford on Madagascar in HIA: A Note on the Sources of Knowledge.**

Crawford's few references to Madagascar and its alleged linguistic affiliation to the Indian Archipelago did not intimate that he at this moment assumed the existence of an insurmountable racial barrier between the inhabitants of these two places. On the contrary, it was analytically treated on an equal basis with all the other analysed languages; as such it was firmly inscribed into the interpretive framework that focussed on the dissemination of the Great Polynesian language and civilization, rather being analytically placed among their racial counterparts in the Indian

---

<sup>1</sup> *Marsden 1834*, pp.32-33. His answer to this was, as we shall later see, that it did not show any resemblances.

<sup>2</sup> For more on Banks, Marsden's study of African languages and their larger context, see *Gascoigne 1994*, pp.167-168.

<sup>3</sup> See *Horneman*, pp.189-192, and *Tuckey*, pp.384-390.

Archipelago proper – viz. the Eastern Negroes.<sup>1</sup> Like the South Seas, Madagascar, in short, constituted an integrated, albeit peripheral, part of Crawford’s analytical scope.

The source-material from which Crawford drew his information of the languages spoken on Madagascar was rather curious, though; furthermore, it appeared to be quite representative of the general level of knowledge of this age, regarding the languages spoken in such distant parts of the world.<sup>2</sup> In the words of Crawford:

“The examples of Madagascar are from the well-known narrative of Robert Drury, who lived fifteen years among the natives. It carries with it internal evidence of authenticity, and the errors into which the writer has fallen are those only incident to an untutored and unlettered mind, errors in orthography and of unskilfulness in selection.”<sup>3</sup>

“Madagascar; or Robert Drury’s Journal, during Fifteen Years Captivity on That Island” had originally been published in 1729 – that is, almost a century before Crawford wrote his book. Apart from thus providing somewhat dated data, which evidently were not considered outdated, Crawford found no reason to question its content, apart from the standard reservations nurtured against such “untutored and unlettered” travellers.

Yet Robert Drury has proven to be a much more controversial figure than Crawford appeared to have appreciated. In fact, the very existence of him has been questioned, and P.G. Adams’ verdict is that he was just yet another product of Daniel Defoe’s fertile imagination.<sup>4</sup> Even though a British archaeologist, M.P. Pearson, recently (2002) claimed to have rehabilitated the actual existence of a Robert Drury who spent fifteen years as a captive on Madagascar,<sup>5</sup> Pearson also acquiesced to the fact that the published version had been embellished and heavily edited by an anonymous editor who almost certainly was Defoe.<sup>6</sup> In his meticulous dissection of the components of this text, P.G. Adams has not only demonstrated Defoe’s inedible mark upon the text but also endeavoured to trace Defoe’s sources; in the context of the vocabularies in the published book, Adams wrote that

---

<sup>1</sup> See esp. HIA, Vol.I, pp.28-29; Crawford here explicitly emphasised the “connection which existed between Madagascar and the Archipelago”, and that it would make no sense to compare the many different, and unaffiliated, languages of “the negro tribes of the [Indian] Archipelago” with that spoken on Madagascar.

<sup>2</sup> That is, just at the moment when the indefatigable works done on native languages by (especially Protestant) Christian missionaries, sent out by the newly founded missionary societies to these distant parts of the world, began to be published and used by metropolitan savants as a valuable source of information. The main publications of this kind on Madagascar would not appear until some ten years later. These missionaries were thus both information gatherers and knowledge producers in their own right: their goal was obviously not merely scientific but also to be able to translate the Scriptures and propagate the faith in these languages. (See *Landau*, and for a more general assessment *Bayly 1989*, pp.136-47, and *Carey 2011*.)

<sup>3</sup> HIA, Vol.II, p.124.

<sup>4</sup> Adams discussed the origins, context, and impact of this book in *Adams 1980*, pp.111-114. For more on the role of Defoe in British discovery literature and imperial imagination, see *Neill 2002*, pp.52-82.

<sup>5</sup> Pearson’s argument was in particular based on archaeological findings of the vessel wrecked on the coast of Madagascar which was referred to in “Robert Drury’s Journal”.

<sup>6</sup> For more on the rhetorical strategies employed by editors of travel literature – whether real, fictive, or false – to vouch for the veracity of the text and to authorise its authenticity, see *Adams 1983*, esp. pp.98-99.

“one of the great inconsistencies in the character of Drury resides in the fact that Defoe made him an ex-slaver and an ex-pirate, who not only never went to school but for some fifteen years spoke no English, and then *endowed him with the ability to draw up a long vocabulary of English and Malagasy words in parallel columns*. This vocabulary also provides more evidence of Defoe’s ability at ‘parquetry’. *While much of it was taken from previous works about Madagascar, it has words that are original and that must have been obtained from the many pirates and sailors Defoe knew*”.<sup>1</sup> So, although Drury as a figure may have been fictional, this does not mean that the vocabulary only grew out of Defoe’s imagination and had no roots in reality. One of the sailors who possibly abetted Defoe in his queries was a certain “Captain Bowrey” – that is, probably the same Thomas Bowrey who some 25 years before had composed the first Malay-English and English-Malay dictionary!<sup>2</sup>

The crucial role played by Defoe in composing “Robert Drury’s Journal” was apparently not established until the late 19<sup>th</sup> C., but there are hints which suggest that some doubt about its provenance must have existed before then.<sup>3</sup> Adams thus pointed to how Pinkerton in his “Voyages and Travels” from 1814 had to stress that “the authenticity of this amusing work seems now fully established”;<sup>4</sup> and Crawford, as we have seen, echoed this opinion. Even if some doubt about the authenticity of this book may have existed at some point, it, nonetheless, remained *the* authoritative text on Madagascar and its language for a much longer period than most texts did, and it exerted a very cogent impact upon the way Madagascar was framed in the European mind. “In composing ‘Robert Drury’s Journal’”, Adams wrote, “Defoe was such a ‘studious geographer and well-read historian’ that he produced an imitation that has been read and quoted more than any of the real travels it imitated and adapted.”<sup>5</sup> Robert Drury was perhaps merely an apocryphal traveller; yet, instead of the more frequent examples of real travellers fabricating fictitious facts,<sup>6</sup> the figure of Drury, on the contrary, represented that of a fictitious traveller conveying real facts! So, even though Drury may not have been an authentic figure, this does not necessarily imply that the information he ‘told’ was incorrect.

---

<sup>1</sup> Adams 1980, p.113; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> On the connections between Bowrey and Daniel Defoe and their mutual uses of each other as sources of information, see Adams 1980, pp.106 & 113.

<sup>3</sup> Adams 1980, p.112.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in Adams 1980, p.112.

<sup>5</sup> Adams 1980, p.114.

<sup>6</sup> On these distinctions between fireside travellers, fictive travellers, and false travellers, as well as their relation to notions of authenticity and sincerity, see Adams 1980 (esp. pp.1-18 & 223-237), Adams 1983, pp.81-102, and Stagl 1995, pp.198-207.

### 1.3.3 Appropriating a Continental Approach: Chamisso and Malte-Brun.

Another contemporary who relied almost solely on the information provided by “Robert Drury’s Journal” for his analysis of the language of Madagascar and its affinity to those of the Indian Archipelago was the French-born German in Russian service, Adelbert Chamisso (1781-1838).<sup>1</sup> Employed as the naturalist on Otto von Kotzebue’s circumnavigation from 1815-1818, Chamisso later contributed substantially to the published account of the voyage; an English edition was published in 1821 where Chamisso provided the material of almost an entire volume.<sup>2</sup> In the part of his “A View of the Great Ocean, of Its Islands, and Its Coasts” that was dedicated to “the contemplation of man”, Chamisso offered a ‘solution’ to the Madagascar question that in central aspects heralded a new period and a paradigm where race figured much more prominently.

On the basis of information supplied by “Robert Drury’s Journal”<sup>3</sup>, Chamisso fully acknowledged the linguistic affinity between Madagascar and the East Indian Islands given that “the identity of many roots with the other dialects are remarkable.”<sup>4</sup> The people who spoke this language on Madagascar were, however, not Negroes, but people whose “hair is long and smooth” and whose “princes are distinguished by fairer complexion”; their resemblance with the “Malay race” was, in Chamisso’s view, striking.<sup>5</sup> These “Madecasses” were, however, not the only inhabitants on the island: apart from these it also housed “*the Vinzimmers, with almost woolly hair, and skulls artificially moulded, with peculiar manners and languages, [who] seem, though now dispersed and unsettled, to have been the aboriginal inhabitants of the island.*”<sup>6</sup>

Chamisso thus upheld an unbroken connection between language and race; from this premise he explained the existence of this language on Madagascar by invoking the, by now familiar, discourse of the *displacement narrative*, in which the black and primitive peoples gradually were driven into the wilderness by an invading race composed of fairer, more civilized nations who all spoke languages pertaining to the (Malayo-)Polynesian language family.

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on Chamisso’s life, career, and publications, see *Liebersohn*, pp.58-76.

<sup>2</sup> The part written by Chamisso runs from Vol.II, p.351 to Vol.III, p.321. I have solely relied on the English translation of this text without consulting any other editions. The question of what might be lost (or added!) in translation appeared to have attained a particular importance in this specific instance; Chamisso thus began his discourse by stressing that he only vouched for the content of the German text (*Chamisso*, p.351), whereas the translator of the text, one H.E. Lloyd, dedicated several pages to plea for the fidelity of his translation to the original (*Kotzebue*, Vol.I, pp.vi-x). In his review of this publication in the *Quarterly Review*, Sir John Barrow, however, found Chamisso’s “caveat against translations of which he cannot judge” sadly well founded in this case where the translation “abounds in errors of the grossest kind.” (*Barrow 1822*, p.264)

<sup>3</sup> *Chamisso*, p.370. He further referred to a 1723 edition of a unnamed work by the German polyhistor Hieronimus Megisserus, or Hieronymus Megiser (1554-1618/1619); he was most known for his Turkish dictionary and grammar. (They were also referred to in *Marsden 1796*, p.43 and *Marsden 1827*, p.81; see also *Tavoni*, p.63)

<sup>4</sup> *Chamisso*, p.370.

<sup>5</sup> *Chamisso*, pp.369-370.

<sup>6</sup> *Chamisso*, p.370; my italics. Chamisso could not decide whether these “Vinzimmers” were ultimately more related to the people on the neighbouring African continent, or to the “Papuas, or Austral Negroes”; yet neither of these were, according to Chamisso, known “as a sea-faring race”. (pp.369-372)

Although placing the description of Madagascar in the volume on Africa in his “Universal Geography, or a Description of All the Parts of the World, on a New Plan”,<sup>1</sup> the Danish born French geographer, Conrad Malte-Brun<sup>2</sup> (1775-1826), emphasised this two-race theory even more. Writing on the population of that island, Malte-Brun concluded that “all the considerable tribes, however, who constitute the great majority of the inhabitants, have *either a tawny complexion and the smooth hair of the Indians, or a black skin and the frizzled hair of the Caffres*. It appears that this island was peopled by very ancient emigrations from both Caffraria and Malabar, that its position is nearest to Africa, but that the periodical winds and a chain of islands connect it to Asia.”<sup>3</sup> Apart from what the geographical circumstances indicated, what could be inferred from the apparent racial composition, and what to Malte-Brun appeared as convincing *etymological* coincidences,<sup>4</sup> he found the most convincing evidence to be “demonstrated by the composition of the prevailing language of Madagascar”.<sup>5</sup> Repudiating the notions aired in J.S. Vater’s continuation of J.C. Adelung’s “Mithridates”,<sup>6</sup> Malte-Brun concluded that “we can affirm that the Madecasse appears *intimately connected with the Malay language*, and particularly with the Javanese and Timorian.”<sup>7</sup> Even though this evidence might not have been sufficient at the present moment to draw any conclusive inferences, this did not deter Malte-Brun from musing whether it was sufficient “to induce us to consider the primitive population as an African colony, subjugated and civilized by the Malays?”<sup>8</sup> Despite being formulated as being nothing more than a hypothesis, the question mark here, nonetheless, seemed more rhetorical than genuinely meant: the general tenor of the discourse left little doubt regarding Malte-Brun’s own, preconceived ideas on this matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> This work, which later was published in many different and rewritten editions was originally planned as a 8 volume work of which Malte-Brun managed to write 6 himself, and the two remainder were finished after his demise. The first English edition was published in Edinburgh in the years 1822-1823 (4 vols. – corresponding to the French vols. 2-5, whereas the first volume on the history of geography was omitted); vol.III & IV which I use here hence correspond to vol.IV & V in the French edition. Malte-Brun coined and introduced the notion of *Oceanica* (sic! *Oceanié* in the French edition; see also *Douglas & Ballard*) in vol.III – Madagscar, however, was explicitly detached from this region. (*Malte-Brun*, Vol.III, p.397)

<sup>2</sup> A biography on Conrad Malte-Brun, or Malthe Conrad Bruun as he was originally called, has recently been published by B. Bredal (see esp. Part II, chapters 9-14 & 18-19 in *Bredal* for his work as a geographer)

<sup>3</sup> *Malte-Brun*, Vol.IV, p.439; my italics. In detecting the route from Asia to Madagascar, Malte-Brun appeared to follow in Hervás’ trail by considering the Malabar coast in India as the stepping stone on a route which also included the Maldives.

<sup>4</sup> He thus thought to see a distinct, and probably significant, coincidence between the proper names ‘Malegache’, ‘Mal-Dives’, and ‘Male-Bar’! (*Malte-Brun*, Vol.IV, p.439)

<sup>5</sup> *Malte-Brun*, Vol.IV, p.439. As linguistic evidence, Malte-Brun adduced a marked coincidence in what he called *principal roots* – and which referred to terms designating such objects as “the most remarkable natural objects” and “the days of the week” – as well as in grammar, demonstrated by “the same want of declensions and flexions”.

<sup>6</sup> The language of Madagascar was described in the third volume of this work, published by Vater in 1812; this volume was solely dedicated to African languages. (*Adelung & Vater*, Vol.III, pp.255-267 were on Madagascar; see also *Davies*, pp.40-42 for more on Adelung and his work) Although admitting that both Reland and Hervás had shown a coincidence between Malagasi and Malayan words, this merely proved that many Malays had once brought these words there, but, according to this work, “denn Gleichheit der Abstammung dieser und der Malegaschen oder Madekassen, wie sich die Einwohner von Madagaskar nennem, folgt daraus noch nicht.” (pp.255-256)

<sup>7</sup> *Malte-Brun*, Vol.IV, p.440; my italics.

<sup>8</sup> *Malte-Brun*, Vol.IV, p.440.

When Raffles and Sir John Barrow co-authored their scathing review of Crawford's HIA in 1822 they would indirectly refer to such a two-race hypothesis, perhaps inadvertently appropriated by Barrow when he earlier that year had reviewed Chamisso's work. In chastising Crawford for falsely claiming the novelty of the (systematic) establishment of a linguistic connection between the Indian Archipelago and Madagascar, they claimed that: "*the agreement in language and customs between the long-haired (not Negro) inhabitants of Madagascar and the Malays* has always been a subject of curious observation, and was long ago pointed by Kaempfer, Flacourt, De Barros, and others; we did not, therefore, expect to find this adduced as a new and original remark".<sup>1</sup> This reference evidently implied the existence of (at least) two different races on Madagascar, one of sharing not only linguistic and cultural traits with the Malays but also apparently exhibiting racial similarities.

#### **1.4 Concluding Remarks.**

This displacement narrative – with its causal coupling of language, race, and civilization – seemed during these years to become the standard theory. It was originally coined by de Brosses and later popularized by J.R. Forster who, after having participated in Cook's 2<sup>nd</sup> Expedition, used it to explain the distributions on the ethnographic map of the Pacific.<sup>2</sup> Shortly after Chamisso publishing his text on Madagascar, the Germans A.W. Schlegel and C. Lassen<sup>3</sup> would launch their *two-race theories* on the earliest history and civilization of India. Here the darker inhabitants of southern India were composed of the vestiges of the aboriginal population who gradually had been driven away by the race of brighter, Indo-German, or Aryan, speaking invaders.<sup>4</sup> This must be one of the indeed rare instances in which an interpretive framework devised to account for dynamics within the Indo-Pacific realm was subsequently imported and implemented on Indian ground; this presented a reversal of the direction in which these ideas usually travelled.<sup>5</sup> Notwithstanding, though, the directionality of exchange within this imperial network of ideas in this particular instance, the *ideological potential* of this paradigm remained evident; it would not require much imagination to see that the modern state formations governed by Indian despots or by Malayo-Polynesian potentates had to succumb to yet another race of white and civilized invaders.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Raffles & Barrow*, p.115; my italics. They did, curiously enough, not refer to Reland here, although Crawford had mentioned him explicitly as a (non-systematic) predecessor. (HIA, vol.II, p.81; the part referred to explicitly by Raffles and Barrow was vol.I, p.28!)

<sup>2</sup> See *Douglass & Ballard*, pp.102-106.

<sup>3</sup> Although Norwegian by birth, Lassen spent most of his professional career in Bonn.

<sup>4</sup> See esp. *Benes 2008*, chapter 5, esp. pp.200-204. For more on the orientalist and scientific contexts in which this German notion of race developed, was transformed and exported, see also *Marchand*, esp. chapters 2-3, as well as the articles in *Eigen & Larrimore*.

<sup>5</sup> The opposite, and indeed much more frequent, movement of ideas and interpretive frameworks from India to the Indo-Pacific realm was the recurring theme of *Ballantyne 2002*.

<sup>6</sup> This theme has especially been addressed by T.R. Trautmann; see e.g. *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.165-216, and *Trautmann 2005*, pp.84-105; see also *Adas*, pp.166-177, *Inden*, pp.56-66, and *Thapar*.

The progress narrative that characterized liberal imperialism was, if not replaced then at least fundamentally remoulded by the introduction of this racial dimension with its connotations of an historical inevitability of continuous strife between unbridgeable ethnicities defined by racial criteria.<sup>1</sup> Yet we should not anticipate such a hard-core racialized version of liberal imperialism which pertains more to the Mid-Victorian era than to the 1820s. Instead we will pause midway between these two periods and take a closer look at the changes and continuities within some of those general ideas and more specific concepts which, though not causing this racialized version of liberal imperialism in any direct sense, still rendered the thinking and formulating of it possible, and which facilitated its intellectual as well as imperial implementations.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Koditschek 2010*, and *Koditschek 2011*, esp. chapter 5, (pp.206-262); for a more general context, see also chapter 6 in *Stocking 1987* (pp.187-237).



## 2. “1834”: Thematic Convergences, Theoretical Discord.

1834 saw the publication in Great Britain of three key texts on this topic, viz. Marsden’s “Miscellaneous Works”, Crawford’s review hereof, and Lang’s “Views of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation”. These, together with the ongoing and almost simultaneous publications of W. von Humboldt’s texts on these matters, epitomize four fundamentally divergent frameworks that each prescribed what they assumed to be the most adequate way in which to construe and apply linguistic evidence within this context.

Each provided a theoretical approach to the earliest history of the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia, complete with a definition, demarcation, and identification of the major historical agents and dynamics. Furthermore, they each offered their own specific hypothesis on the origin and dissemination of the Malay language, as well as its affiliation with race, nation and/or civilization. These, mutually incompatible, approaches thus contended to occupy the same field, and this invariably implied an intellectual environment characterised by heated debates in which the protagonists often seemed more to talk at cross purposes than actually engaging the opponents’ arguments at their own premises.

### 2.1 *The Contexts.*

#### 2.1.1 From Scholar-Administrator to Metropolitan Savant.

Once more it was a publication by Marsden that initiated a discursive moment. In what proved to be the last text published by himself,<sup>1</sup> “Miscellaneous Works by William Marsden”, Marsden summed up the knowledge gained through a lifetime of study on the languages spoken in Southeast Asian and the Pacific. Among the texts contained in this publication the long essay “On the Polynesian, or East-Insular Languages” stood out. Although this essay did not convey much new, it did provide an updated and quite extended synthesis of all what Marsden had earlier written on these matters;<sup>2</sup> in addition, it offered a spirited refutation of the hypothesis regarding the region’s earliest history and the dissemination of language and civilization which Crawford in the meantime had provided in HIA. In time, this would become one of the standard texts on this topic but it did also have a more immediate impact; beyond the confines of the British Isles it was thus reviewed, or

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden died in 1836, and his widow, Elizabeth W. Marsden, a daughter of the celebrated Sanskritist, Charles Wilkins, would publish his autobiography, “Brief Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Late William Marsden” two years later. The core of the text was written by Marsden himself sometime after 1828, and to this his widow had posthumously attached extensive extracts of Marsden’s correspondence in the footnotes. (*Marsden 1838*, pp.v-vii)

<sup>2</sup> As it has been discussed on Part III. See also the German review of it by a certain Meinicke; this would most probably be the geographer Carl E. Meinicke (1803-1876) who would later write much more on these topics. W. von Humboldt also referred to Meinicke’s studies in this field, and in particular to his hypothesis regarding *the origin of the Malayan group of peoples* [“Ursprung des Malayischen Völkerstammes”] as resulting from racial intermixture between the Negrito race [“Negrito-Race”], the original inhabitants, and foreign immigrants possessing an adventitious culture. (*Humboldt 1836*, p.viii; for the English translation, *Humboldt 1988*, p.15)

composed a major text in a review article, in France, in Germany, as well as in the USA.<sup>1</sup> And at home it would, as we have already seen, constitute the main reference in Crawford's "The Countries, Nations, and Languages of the Oceanic Region". It was in this article that Crawford finally divorced himself from any adherence to Marsden's terminology, such as e.g. the references to a *great Polynesian language*; instead, and in open opposition to Marsden, he now polemically launched his own theories of linguistic and racial polygenesis, followed by a hypothesis on the dissemination of linguistic elements (rather than full languages) through a spread of civilization facilitated by travel, trade, conquest, or colonization.

Crawford, who had settled down in London in 1827, had by now become an efficacious paid agent for the private Calcutta merchants,<sup>2</sup> he had played a major part in the successful campaign that ended the EIC monopolies on the China trade,<sup>3</sup> and he was about to embark on a political career as a Radical which, however, ended before it had really begun. Yet, when compared to Marsden, Crawford nevertheless seemed to perceive himself as a relative newcomer on the metropolitan scene; at least he presented himself as such in a private letter addressed to Marsden, announcing his pending review of the latter's "Miscellaneous Works":

"I have just finished a Review of some works on the East-Insular Countries, where you appear in your proper position at the head of the list. You will see, though I have always looked up to you as my master in our common pursuits, I have ventured to skirmish with you over two-and-thirty octavo pages; but I am by no means prepared to say I have the best of the battle. The *public*, however, will decide between us in this matter, when *I can almost anticipate the theorists will be on my side, and the men of experience and practice on yours*."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Most French texts on Oceania and its inhabitants accorded Marsden's writings an important place in their discourses; for Germany, see *Meinicke*; and two years later Marsden's text (together with J.D. Lang's ditto) played a prominent part in a review article on the "South Sea Islands" published in the *American Quarterly Review* (without mentioning Crawford's name, this article also referred to the review in *Foreign Quarterly review* and its "able English writer"; see *American Quarterly Review* 1836, e.g. pp.6-7 & 14)

<sup>2</sup> A position from which Crawford acquired a considerable emolument, but which was later used against him in the debates that ensued concerning the monopolies held by the EIC; here this position was discursively presented as that of a mere paid opinion-monger whose bias was based on his direct pecuniary interests, and whose credibility thence appeared discredited. This rhetoric was in particular advanced by the Anglo-Irish R.M. Martin who, like Crawford, was a surgeon by training and had extensive colonial experience in the East, and who, upon his return to Great Britain, continued his active interest in colonial issues; despite his reformist leanings, Martin, however, staunchly defended a protectionist colonial politics which favoured the present position of the EIC; as a result he became Crawford's direct opponent in the 'pamphlet engagements' that preceded the abolition of the EIC monopoly on China trade in 1833. (For references to Crawford as a "paid agent", see e.g. *Martin 1832b*, p.2 and especially *Martin 1832a*, pp.17,18, & 68.) (For more on Martin, See the entry on R.M. Martin by F.H.H. King in the ODNB, and *Hillemann*, pp.178-181)

<sup>3</sup> For more on these debates leading up to the abolishment of the EIC monopoly on Chinese trade, see *Hillemann*, pp.171-187. For references to, or longer analyses of, Crawford's role as a commercial agent for first private merchants in Calcutta and later also in the Straits Settlements, see *Stokes*, pp.64 & 130; *Turnbull*, esp. pp.322-323; *Kumagai 2008*, esp. pp.111-146; *Kumagai 2010*; and *Webster 2010*.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in *Marsden 1838*, pp.169-170, in the footnotes posthumously inserted by Marsden's wife. My italics.

Although Marsden and Crawford to a large extent moved within the same circles of oriental scholars, and they shared memberships of many of the same learned societies in London, just as much appeared to keep them apart as to connect them. Whereas Marsden had been one of the most prominent members of the Royal Society, Crawford, by all accounts, appeared a very passive member;<sup>1</sup> this pattern seemed, perhaps more surprisingly so, to repeated itself in the newly founded Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.<sup>2</sup> When Crawford finally decided to once more devote most of his energies to scholarly and scientific matters, that is from the 1840s and onwards, it primarily took place in newly founded venues dominated by his fellow compatriot and friend, Sir R.I. Murchison – such as the Royal Geographical Society (RGS) and the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS).<sup>3</sup> Later he would play a prominent part in the reinvigoration of the Ethnological Society which had grown out of the philanthropic movement; as such it could be considered an offspring of the Aborigines Protection Society (APS).<sup>4</sup>

### **2.1.2 Committed to a Cause: Crawford's Political Affiliations and Oriental Scholarship.**

However, by the 1830s Crawford was deeply immersed in political issues, and this obviously influenced the circles in which he moved. These included individuals like his old comrade in arms during the Anti-EIC campaigns, old India hand and Scotsman, the Radical member of parliament Joseph Hume;<sup>5</sup> his brother in law, Sir Thomas Erskine Perry, a fellow contender of the Radical cause and later a prominent judge and jurist in Bombay;<sup>6</sup> he was also a known figure to the likes of J. Bentham<sup>7</sup> and R. Cobden, the latter whom Crawford introduced to the Whig inclined Reform Club in 1837;<sup>8</sup> and, as mentioned earlier, he co-authored the abolitionist article on “Sugar without Slavery” with Thomas Perronet Thompson.<sup>9</sup>

In sum these individuals clearly represented a densely politicised environment rather than a lofty milieu of ‘detached’ gentlemen, solely dedicated to what would appear as the pure nature of

<sup>1</sup> See *Home*, p.39 & p.324 regarding Crawford's election as a member of the Royal Society in 1818. A.B. Granville stated positively in 1836 that Crawford had not contributed in any way to its journal, *Philosophical Transactions* (*Granville*, p.47); nor did he appear to have contributed in any other conspicuous way within this venue.

<sup>2</sup> The Royal Asiatic Society was founded in 1823 by the former President of the Asiatic Society of the Bengal, Sir H.T. Colebrooke, it received its Royal Charter the year after; it did not, however, begin to publish its journal until a decade later, from 1834 and onwards. (See also *Kejariwal*, pp.140-141 and *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp. 138-39) Although Crawford figured as a member in the 1<sup>st</sup> volume of their journal (*JRAS*, p.xliii), he appears never to have contributed to the journal.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. the obituary in *Murchison*. For more on Murchison and his relations to Crawford, see *Stafford*. For more on BAAS as a shared space – advocating “religious liberalism, gentlemanly restraint, and social integration” – where the rising middle class could meet with the aristocracy and the gentry on amiable terms at its annual meetings in different cities, see *Livingstone 2003*, pp.108-111 (the quotation is from p.109), *Withers, Finnegan, & Higgitt*, and *Withers 2011*.

<sup>4</sup> See *Heartfield*, esp. pp.9-41; *Ellingson*, pp.219-231; and *Stocking 1987*, pp.240-245.

<sup>5</sup> See *Taylor*, esp. pp.291 & 299.

<sup>6</sup> Both Crawford and Erskine Perry were members of the “Radical Club” in London (List quoted in *Rowe*, p.120)

<sup>7</sup> For Crawford's direct correspondence with Bentham, see *O'Sullivan & Fuller*, Vol.12, p.452.

<sup>8</sup> Information given in *Fagan*, p.40.

<sup>9</sup> Published in the *Westminster Review* in 1833 (in the July-Oct. edition, pp.247-262); see also *Turner*, p.119.

scholarly pursuits. At this historical conjuncture of parliamentary reform and of profound societal transformations both at home and in the colonial field – where the proconsular, military-fiscalism of the Age of the Imperial Meridian gradually gave way to the visions of a the laissez-faire dominated bourgeois ideology of early Victorian informal imperialism<sup>1</sup> – these two aspects of politics and knowledge production appeared even more inseparable than usual: “high politics and reviewing were intimately related”, as W. Thomas has argued, and “politicians and men of letters [as well as ‘men of science’] mingled in the same clubs, the same salons, and the same country house parties.”<sup>2</sup> Yet this interaction – and moving in some of the same social circles defined by shared memberships to certain clubs and learned societies – did obviously not imply that the political fault lines were blurred, let alone unrecognized. On the contrary, this politicised metropolitan society was acutely characterised by its entwined relations between social status, political position, and venues of publication.<sup>3</sup> A change of the latter would thus most probably indicate either a shift in political allegiances, or, as in Crawford’s case, it would discursively reflect and underpin the strategic manoeuvres through which these protagonists deliberately sought to posit themselves most advantageously within this socio-political space.

After returning from Asia, Crawford had by and large abandoned his affiliation with the Edinburgh review and instead taken to a prolific publication of pamphlets;<sup>4</sup> the only exception was the publication of his two travelogues discussed in Part II. Despite always favouring literary merit and intelligent criticism over political allegiance, the Edinburgh Review was renowned for its strong support of political reform and the Whig cause. Yet, when Crawford, by now an aspiring Radical politician, took up publishing articles again after 1833, he did so mainly in the Westminster Review. Founded in 1824 as a thoroughly Benthamite journal, the Westminster Review expounded more radical views than the Edinburgh Review, and at times they were directly at odds with each other.<sup>5</sup> Throughout its most turbulent history in the mid-1830s,<sup>6</sup> Crawford published a series of articles on taxation and monopolies, on British connections with China, on the new colony in South

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of these concepts so cogent in recent historiography on British colonialism and Empire and on their use as tools of periodization, see *Thompson 2008*, in particular pp.42-46.

<sup>2</sup> *Thomas 2000*, p.136.

<sup>3</sup> On the different spaces of London science, the epistemes they engendered, and the ideological battles which were fought there, see *Lightman*.

<sup>4</sup> Since his review of Raffles’ HJ in 1819, Crawford had only published one article in the Edinburgh Review, viz. “Indian Taxation of Englishmen” in 1828. (*Crawford 1828c*) From 1821 to 1827 Crawford had been in Southeast Asia, conducting two diplomatic missions, and between 1823-1826 being the Resident of Singapore; during this period, Crawford had instigated the publication of Singapore’s first newspaper, the Singapore Chronicle, as well as being one of its main contributors. *Gibson-Hill 1953*, pp.175-180 and *Turnbull 1972*, pp.130-131)

<sup>5</sup> See *Houghton*, Vol.III, pp.531 & 533.

<sup>6</sup> On the Westminster Review, the competing London Review founded by the Mills, and their merger in 1836 under J.S. Mill’s guardianship, see *Houghton*, vol.III, pp.534-538.

Australia, and on colonial expenditure in general.<sup>1</sup> All of these topics figured prominently on the contemporary political agenda. After EIC's monopoly on the direct China trade had come to an end in 1833,<sup>2</sup> trade and interest in China soared; in the years preceding the Opium War, 1839-1842, missionaries as well as opium clippers swarmed both the Chinese littoral and the literature at home.<sup>3</sup> The debates following in the wake of the proposed colonization schemes for South Australia were deeply embedded in the grander questions of civilization, its cultivation and dissemination, as K. O'Brien has recently argued.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the question on colonization constituted one of the main points of discord between the radical factions: whereas both of the Mills were receptive towards Wakefield's colonial schemes, Crawford sided with its opponents – like Perronet Thompson and Bowring who were the editors of the Westminster Review. Accordingly, Crawford used their journal to advocate against such forms of systematic colonization.<sup>5</sup> He published his last article in the journal in early 1836, shortly before the Mills' faction took over the control of the journal<sup>6</sup> and right before his own political aspirations finally petered out.

The article on “The Countries, Nations, and Languages of the Oceanic Region”, however, appeared in the Foreign Quarterly Review. Although this periodical did also have an unmistakeably liberal leaning, it was more renowned for its “political fairness” and the high quality of its articles.<sup>7</sup> This, together with the fact that Crawford was acquainted with many of the persons in its inner circles,<sup>8</sup> might have prompted Crawford to publish this more scholarly and less politically inclined article here.<sup>9</sup> Yet, notwithstanding whatever motives Crawford may have nurtured, we are allowed to assume that this change in the venue of publication affected both the scope and the composition of the readership reached by this article; furthermore, it most probably influenced the manner in

---

<sup>1</sup> See Crawford 1833a, Crawford 1834b, Crawford 1834c, Crawford 1834d, Crawford 1834e, Crawford 1834f, Crawford 1835a, Crawford 1835b, and Crawford 1836.

<sup>2</sup> To which Crawford had contributed in a not altogether insignificant way!

<sup>3</sup> On this period, see e.g. Greenberg, esp. pp.104-215, Tsao 2000, Tsao 2008, Sample, and Hillemann, pp.34-105. Besides these articles, Crawford was also the co-author of a 3 volume (octavo) work on “An Historical and Descriptive Account of China” (Edinburgh, 1836), together with Hugh Murray (main editor) and four others.

<sup>4</sup> O'Brien, esp. pp.26-31

<sup>5</sup> Here I concur with Quilty's interpretation (Quilty 2001, p.79-80). For more on this topic. see also O'Brien, pp.29-30; Semmel 1961, pp.19-21; and Semmel 1970, pp.100-129.

<sup>6</sup> Houghton, vol.III, pp.535-538.

<sup>7</sup> Houghton, vol.II, p.132. (Under the entry on the Foreign Quarterly Review)

<sup>8</sup> Such as his fellow Scotsman and occasional contributor to the Edinburgh Review, J.R. McCulloch. (Houghton, vol.II, p.131) More on the relationship between Crawford and McCulloch, see Quilty 2001, pp.78-82 & 166-167.

<sup>9</sup> Although this journal was primarily intended as “a source of information on cotemporary foreign literature”, it did also publish articles on a number of other subjects – in particular on Britain's position abroad and especially in Asia. As such Crawford's article belonged, even if somewhat indirectly, to the latter category, and it furthermore complied to the letter of the former, given that the article presented itself as being a review of not only Marsden's and C.H. Thomsen's texts but also of foreign publications written by A. Balbi, C.P.J. Elout, and M. Laplace. Yet, apart from Marsden's text and occasional references to Balbi, all the others only occupied a circumstantial position in the discourse. In concert with many other articles published in the (Victorian) Reviews, this ‘review’ was also in reality an essay on Crawford's own linguistic theories being paraded as a review of Marsden's. (Houghton, vol.II, pp.129 & 132 on this tendency)

which the article was received and subsequently interpreted by these readers.<sup>1</sup> Thence “the public”, referred to in the letter by Crawford to Marsden, would be significantly different from the one to which Crawford addressed (and who read) his more overtly politically imbued articles in the *Westminster Review*. One of these new readers was W. von Humboldt who thus, shortly before his death in April 1835, referred explicitly to this article and to the theory it advanced on the existence of a third race in this region.<sup>2</sup>

Despite ostensibly exhibiting a purely academic nature, this article still needs to be situated within its contemporary cultural and political contexts; even a topic of such a scholarly nature as this could not avoid being embroiled in both domestic and colonial politics. During these years the question regarding the discursive prioritisation of the concepts of civilization vs. culture had become acutely politicised. This was probably most clearly exemplified by the opposition between J.S. Mill’s ideas on civilization on the one hand and Coleridge’s writings on the constitution and the church on the other, such as we have discussed in Part I. *Culture*, and its accompanying notion of *nation* and *national specificity*, could thus in different contexts either serve as a counterprinciple – epitomizing notions of spirit, internality, and authenticity – to civilization, and hence this distinction would constitute a conceptual fault line; or it could, in the words of A. Sartori, “be posited as a complementary or even metonymically subordinate moment of civilization”.<sup>3</sup> In the latter case, culture would be perceived as the refined compliment, or superstructure, to the baser elements of civilization, signifying a set of superior values when compared to the mere materialism and blind progress ingrained in civilization, if this was devoid of culture. In the former civilization and culture were instead oppositional: discursively they provided the demarcation between the two contending positions and delineated their respective conceptual approaches, they each defined the positive content of these positions, and they furthermore determined what issues that in these confrontations were deemed pertinent and of importance.

The ideological implications of this – at the same time dialectically entwined and politically divisional – distinctions were pervasive: it provided an all integrating structure,<sup>4</sup> and as always these concepts were fundamental to Crawford’s discourse. His materialistic concept of civilization provided an interpretive framework that rather effortlessly linked topics stretching from philology

---

<sup>1</sup> In this context D.N. Livingstone operated with what he called *spaces of speech*. “Social spaces both shape and are shaped by speech – by what can and cannot be said in particular venues, by how things are said, and by the way they are heard.” (*Livingstone 2007*, p.75.)

<sup>2</sup> In “*Humboldt 1836*, vol.I, p.vii (p.15 in *Humboldt 1988*). According to G. Reutter, Humboldt also referred to this article in *Humboldt 1836*, vol.I, p.44 and in *Humboldt 1839*, vol.III, p.428, although these two were without any explicit bibliographical references.

<sup>3</sup> *Sartori 2005*, p.682; reiterated in *Sartori 2008*, p.30.

<sup>4</sup> Even the divergent readings of John Locke’s philosophy were thus divided along the same conceptual, ideological, and intellectual fault lines as sketched here, such as it has been lucidly demonstrated by H. Aarsleff in the article “Locke’s Reputation in Nineteenth-Century England”. (*Aarsleff 1982*, pp.120-145)

to trade, from monopolies to present politics, and it firmly embedded them all within a pervasively mechanistic, progressionist trope.

Hence, the socio-politico-cultural positioning of each actor within the matrix provided by this specific historical conjuncture predisposed the meanings vested in, and the importance attached to, the concepts of nation, race, and civilization within the discourses, and it influenced terms with which these concepts were denominated.<sup>1</sup>

This even counted for Marsden's manifestly apolitical and alleged neutral approach too; even detached aloofness reflected a more or less deliberate positioning. Speaking from such a place of authorial knowledge, or from what T. Gieryn in another context has called a *truth spot*,<sup>2</sup> was obviously not less, but only differently, located than the those kinds of knowledge and modes of knowledge production that were considered partial and biased. As a scion of the Banksian system, Marsden's discourse did not emanate from 'nowhere' but, on the contrary, from an acutely powerful somewhere;<sup>3</sup> "physical location, social positioning, and cognitive authority were intricately interwoven", as D.N. Livingstone has stressed.<sup>4</sup> Even though Banks's aristocratic regime by now was on the wane, and in the 1830s gradually became replaced by more integrative venues, such as the RGS and the BAAS, Marsden's opinions continued to be held in high regard.<sup>5</sup> His erudition was highly esteemed; this, combined with the intrinsically cautious tone of his discourse, vested it with an universally acknowledged authority that might be contested, as done by Crawford, but it could hardly be derided and it was never easily dismissed.

### **2.1.3 Missionaries, Scholars, and Colonial Administrators.**

According to himself, J.D. Lang chiefly wrote his "View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation" while being sea-bound between New South Wales and Great Britain. Even though he later, when staying in London, had the opportunity to reedit the text, he still emphasised its geographically more peripheral character, and he lamented the absence of access to the newest knowledge available in, for instance, the library of the British Museum during the initial work on this text. "The only time I have been able to devote to literary labour for several years past", he wrote, "has been the time I have passed on ship-board – either amid storms and icebergs in the high latitudes of the southern hemisphere, or beneath vertical suns within the tropics, – where the only books to be had, in addition to the few odd volumes in the corner of one's own trunk, are the stars of heaven by night by night, or the flying-fish and the dolphin by day."<sup>6</sup> Instead of alluding to the

---

<sup>1</sup> "Social spaces facilitate and condition discursive space. They do not determine it." (Livingstone 2003, p.7)

<sup>2</sup> See Gieryn.

<sup>3</sup> Shapin 1998, p.8 and Livingstone 2003, p.184.

<sup>4</sup> Livingstone 2003, p.182.

<sup>5</sup> See Livingstone 1992a, pp.155-160, Lightman, pp.27-29 & 34-36, and Gascoigne 2011, pp.51-59.

<sup>6</sup> Lang, pp.vi-vii.

ship as a privileged space of knowledge production – and which was epitomized in the large state-sponsored scientific expeditions of exploration – Lang here used the ship as a metaphor for utter isolation, as a space cut off from the rest of the cultural world; fit, perhaps, for natural observation, but not it did not exactly prove conducive to scholarly pursuits of this kind that depended on the availability of the commodities afforded by a learned community.

As the first Presbyterian minister in the Australian colonies, Lang stood out from the two former scholar-administrators who were now firmly settled in the London metropolis. Not only did the geographical distance separate them but at times they also seemed to inhabit different, albeit interwoven, epistemic spaces.

Although the geographical distance obviously rendered communication in this burgeoning age of steam much more cumbersome than it is today, recent research nonetheless tends to emphasize the importance of such circulation of knowledge and transfer of ideas both over space and between cultures.<sup>1</sup> Besides, rather than perceiving these movements within a stringent centre-periphery structure, the trend is now to focus on the entangled and multi-directional networks through which such knowledge was conveyed.<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding the undeniable “structural inequality through which interaction took place”<sup>3</sup> over space and in between cultures, undercutting a simple metropole-binary “enables us to think about the inherent relationality of nodal points or ‘centres’ within an empire”;<sup>4</sup> such “a networked conception of imperial interconnectedness is very fruitful if one wants to consider metropole and colony, or colony and colony, within the same analytical frame, and without necessarily privileging either one of these places.”<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, a conceptualization of our analytical approach to empire and knowledge production in terms of “structures of intersecting webs”<sup>6</sup> enables us to move beyond the confines of the British Empire; it facilitates an inclusion of other colonial spaces, as well as other metropolises in our analytical framework – thus Germany, France, USA, and the Dutch East Indies can, for instance, be included in the research as ‘natural’

---

<sup>1</sup> The literature on this topic is vast; in this context I have in particular been inspired by *Lester 2001, Lester 2006, Ballantyne 2002 Livingstone 2003, Livingstone 2005, Livingstone 2007, Livingstone 2011, Raj*, the special issues dedicated to this topic in *Itinerario* in 2009 (see esp. the introductory article by *Roberts 2009*) and in *Isis* in 2010 (in particular *Safier and Sivasundaram*), as well as *Gascoigne 2011*.

<sup>2</sup> K. Raj in this context advocated a methodology that proceeds “by following the conduits and heterogenous networks of exchange through which transfers of knowledge passed, by locating the spaces of circulation..., in which they acquired meaning, and finally by focussing on the appropriation and grounding on these knowledges in specific localities within these spaces of circulation”. (*Raj*, p.22)

<sup>3</sup> This quote is taken from *Trautmann 2009b*, p.11. Here it referred explicitly to the modes of interaction between Indian intellectuals employed in the EIC service and their nominal superiors, the British scholar-administrators, in the processes of knowledge production (especially within philology) in colonial Madras and Calcutta; however, I think the expression apt to describe the modes of interaction on a more aggregated, even global, level as well.

<sup>4</sup> *Lester 2006*, p.133.

<sup>5</sup> *Lester 2006*, pp.133-134.

<sup>6</sup> I have borrowed this concept of “empire as structures of intersecting webs” from *Hodge*, p.17.



object of study. Yet one ought not to be blind to the fact that the historical actors studied here, in their capacity as information gatherers and knowledge producers, themselves<sup>1</sup> nonetheless often viewed their world from an angle that certainly privileged the centre and accorded a specific authority to the knowledge produced in this place.<sup>2</sup> Hence, despite the multifarious entanglements and hybridity ingrained in this network structure, outsiders – whether geographically, socially, or racially defined – nevertheless remained outsiders! And, accordingly, J.D. Lang chose to rhetorically present himself as such when publishing his “View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation” in 1834.

The discrepant discursive formations of the devout missionary, with his solid edifice of an universal Scriptural authority,<sup>3</sup> on the one hand, and the interest and occupations the scholar-administrators, whether of a theoretical inclination or belonging to the men of experience and practice, on the other produced each their divergent epistemological space. These were characterized by their specific discourses guided by different logics as well as focussing on variant objects and ends; at times this resulted in apparently incommensurable texts.<sup>4</sup> In the preceding Parts we have already had ample experience of this in the case of Lang and Crawford. Although this implied that these texts often inadvertently talked at cross purposes and/or deliberately refused to accept the premises of each other’s arguments, one should be wary of exaggerating these differences, though.

T.R. Trautmann has recently argued against the upholding of a strict orientalist-missionary binary in an Indian context; although admitting on that “on the one hand, the difference between the Orientalist and the missionary was strongly marked both discursively and in policy in British India”, he maintained that “on the other hand, many missionaries were Orientalist scholars and many Orientalists had strong Christian beliefs, putting the very terms of comparison in doubt at the outset.”<sup>5</sup> Hence “the Orientalist and the missionary are *ideal types* that flow into one another in practice.”<sup>6</sup> Whereas British India in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. was a divided space between the

---

<sup>1</sup> Both those residing in the metropolis and often those in the periphery too who strove to obtain the recognition of the metropolitan savants.

<sup>2</sup> On the metropole of London as a privileged ‘truth spot’, see *Lightman*. In the context of colonial science J. Gascoigne speaks of “from the perspective of London” which, in the eyes of many contemporary scientists (like e.g. J. Hooker), perceived London as *the* great imperial ‘centre of calculation’. (*Gascoigne 2011*, esp. pp.60-61) J. Vetter has dealt with kindred questions in the case of A.R. Wallace’s dual socio-scientific roles as a ‘fact gatherer’ in the field and later as a metropolitan theoretician as well. (See *Vetter2006* and *Vetter 2009*)

<sup>3</sup> For more on this genre of literature associated with this, its referential framework, and discursive rationales, see especially *Livingstone 1992b*, *Livingstone 2008*, and *Kidd 2006*.

<sup>4</sup> I have here followed B.S. Cohn’s notion of the production and impact of a *discursive formation* in the colonial South Asian setting (*Cohn 1996*, p.21) and then appropriated it to fit into my agenda here.

<sup>5</sup> *Trautmann 2009a*, p.195; from the article “The Missionary and the Orientalist”, pp.189-207.

<sup>6</sup> *Trautmann 2009a*, pp.195 & 207.

Orientalist scholar-administrator and the missionary, the Pacific became increasingly the domain of the latter category. Apart from the infrequent, but significant visits by seaborne scientific expeditions and the odd sailor or whaler whose curiosity was actually both turned into print and acknowledged as a valuable scientific contribution by the savants at home, most knowledge production on this region was done by British or American missionaries who went out to convert and live among the islanders.<sup>1</sup> Their contributions, especially in the fields of philology and ethnology, were widely read and well received at home. Both Marsden and Crawfurd, by now settled metropolitan savants, used these extensively as *sources of information* on this region.

As an example of this, Crawfurd included C.H. Thomsen's "A Vocabulary of the English, Bugis, and Malay Languages" in his article in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* and treated it on par with the other writings. Thomsen, by birth a Dane,<sup>2</sup> was sent out by London Missionary Society in 1815; in time he managed to establish a printing-press (the Mission Press) in Singapore which published texts in the Chinese, Siamese, and Bugis characters,<sup>3</sup> he became involved in teaching Malay children, and he also engaged in a close cross-cultural collaboration with learned Malays amongst whom Abdullah Munsyi was the most renowned. Thomsen's work thus differed substantially from the project which Lang advanced in "View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation"; rather than airing such grandiose theories as Lang's, Thomsen's philological work was of more pragmatic nature, and it appeared much more grounded in practical issues of translation and teaching<sup>4</sup> – as it was testified by the plain matter-of-fact character of his Bugis vocabulary.<sup>5</sup>

In contrast, J.D. Lang certainly aspired to something else than merely being a skilled informant and producer of vocabularies, dictionaries, and grammars; indeed, his "View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation" did not betray any profound knowledge of the language spoken in this huge region.<sup>6</sup> Instead, he provided an interpretive framework firmly based in Scriptural history, and in this he inscribed many of the same linguistic, historical, and ethnological

<sup>1</sup> On the British (and American) missionary activities in the Pacific. see e.g. *Liebersohn 2006*, pp.225-272, *Twells*, pp.178-210, and the relevant articles in *Etherington* (as well as the relevant parts of *Porter 2005*; *Barker*, pp.86-96 & 101-104; and *Landau*, pp.198-203). For an analysis of the larger contexts, see *Carey 2011*.

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd called him a Dane (*Crawfurd 1834a*, p.371) whereas Abdullah Munsyi stated that he was German (quoted in *Noorduyn*, p.245); Thomsen came to Malacca in 1815, and thus he knew as well as collaborated with both Crawfurd and Abdullah Munsyi before returning to England in the mid-1830s. (*Milner 1981*, pp.46-47 & 50) According to Milner, Thomsen was from Holstein, a predominantly German speaking part of the Danish state up to 1864.

<sup>3</sup> And "the two last being the first attempts of the kind ever made." (*Crawfurd 1834a*, pp.371-372)

<sup>4</sup> See *Milner 2002*, pp.71-80. On Thomsen's work with Abdullah Munsyi, see also *Putten and Sweeney*. For a contemporary assessment of Thomsen's work within a larger context of missionary philology, see *Edwards*, p.180.

<sup>5</sup> Thus the general structure of the vocabulary appeared to have been organized along the same principles as those ingrained in Marsden's word list; that is, a structure primarily focussing on the *simple ideas* from which the more sophisticated notions associated with a more advanced society then were derived. See *Thomsen 1834*. For more on British missionary activities among Chinese and natives in Southeast Asia, see *Hillemann*, pp.141-149.

<sup>6</sup> His discourse was mainly composed of a grandiose synthesis based on a very broad, non-specialist mode of argument. Nor did Lang seem to have written anything else on these matters, although he, as stressed by P. Battersby, eagerly advocated an Australian expansion northwards to New Guinea and the Indian Archipelago. (*Battersby*, pp.22 & 28)

data as those used by Marsden and Crawford; they were, however, invoked as evidence of something else and with an entirely different outcome. The publications on Southeast Asia were mainly written by present or former scholar-administrators,<sup>1</sup> and in this context Lang's discourse was, perhaps, rather exceptional; kindred discourses were, however, rife in many texts on the near Orient and on central Asia, as it has been demonstrated by e.g. M. Olender, D.N. Livingstone, and T. Benes.<sup>2</sup>

In spite of this epistemic divergence between Lang's text of the one hand, and those by Marsden and Crawford on the other, they thus still, to a large extent, shared a methodological congruence; this facilitated a clash on a 'theoretical battlefield' where the notions of race, nation, and civilization composed some of the main points of contestation over which they fought.

Notwithstanding this epistemic divergence and a firm rooting in Scriptural authority, the "View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation" did not merely linger on in some sort of parallel discursive universe. On the contrary, it appeared to be included in the scholarly debates on the ethnology, philology, and earliest history in this region on equal terms with the other texts on these topics.

It thus received lengthy reviews in the *Monthly Review*,<sup>3</sup> a theologically non-conformist and politically Whig-orientated periodical, as well as in the *JRGS*,<sup>4</sup> and it constituted one of the texts in the review article on "The South Seas" published in the *American Quarterly Review*; although the author of this latter article was not "intending to adopt his conclusions",<sup>5</sup> he nonetheless perceived Lang as a "writer of ingenuity and research",<sup>6</sup> and his Biblically imbibed hypothesis was treated on

---

<sup>1</sup> With the important exceptions of G.W. Earl & J.R. Logan who wrote extensively on these topics in their capacity as learned, private individuals who were settled and worked in Southeast Asia. Earl, however, did actually occupy minor posts in the Straits Settlements administration in the later years of his life. (See *Turnbull 1971*, pp.xiv-xvii)

<sup>2</sup> See *Olender* and the relevant parts of *Livingstone 2008* (esp. pp.80-136), *Benes 2006* and *Benes 2008* (e.g. pp.73-76 on F. Schlegel's later attempts "to reconcile his [originally secularly founded] distinction between cultured and barbaric peoples with a monogenetic Christian philosophy of history."

<sup>3</sup> *Monthly Review 1834*, pp.264-277. Although admitting that the reviewer was at first "startled at this hypothesis, so novel and bold", the "learned author" proved to be a "clear-headed man, and dexterous in wielding hard arguments"; hence the reviewer concluded "that the result of inquiry, as conducted in this volume, is equally gratifying and unexpected, and that it throws a flood of light on one of the darkest and most mysterious chapters in the history of man." (pp.264-265) And "it must be confessed indeed, by everyone that follows the plain declarations of Scripture, that the author's doctrine is sound; but, besides, the real state of the facts in the history of modern missions leads to the same conclusion." (p.277)

<sup>4</sup> The review here was also both long (some ten pages) and sober, although it chiefly consisted of lengthy excerpts. The reviewer's commentaries were sparse, and his conclusion was definitely more reserved than the one in the *Monthly Review*: "we think that he has established his main point; and, moreover, that he has brought within a moderate compass a great many curious facts and coincidences. We wish that he had, at the same time, expressed himself on some occasions with more deference for previous writers." (*JRGS 1834*, p.67). Lang was, however, a notorious polemicist whose confrontational style was more direct than subtle, such as H.M. Carey has shown it in the context of colonial church politics (*Carey 2011*, pp.226-227, 234-235, & 334-335); later, Lang lost a libel case in Australia and was sentenced to spend 4 months in gaol. (ODNB, *Baker*)

<sup>5</sup> *American Quarterly Review*, p.17.

<sup>6</sup> *American Quarterly Review*, p.21.

par with Marsden's, as well as the ideas suggested by the "able English writer"<sup>1</sup> who reviewed Marsden in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*. Less surprisingly, perhaps, was T. Hodgkin's inclusion of Lang's text as expounding views "which appear to me to deserve considerable attention" in his "On the Importance of Studying and Preserving the Languages Spoken by Uncivilized Nations."<sup>2</sup> As one of the more prominent founders of the Christian philanthropic APS, the Quaker Hodgkin<sup>3</sup> actually referred more extensively to Lang than to any other author whatsoever in this text.<sup>4</sup> Hodgkin thus claimed that this new work "deserve considerable attention";<sup>5</sup> yet his assessment of its conclusions was not without reservations, and he counterposed it to the other key texts pertaining to this discursive moment:

"The views of Dr. Lang, although founded on observation and supported by several independent facts, and also possessing in my opinion a great degree of probability, can only be regarded as a hypothetical solution to the mystery which involves the history and languages of the races to which it refers. It must be remembered that it is opposed to the views of that great Polynesian Scholar W. Marsden, and is yet more decidedly at variance with the opinion of a learned author [Crawfurd] of an article on the Oceanic languages in the *Foreign Quarterly Review*."<sup>6</sup>

#### **2.1.4 From Theorist to Provider of Information: W. Humboldt's and Crawfurd.**

Reverence was the common denominator for most of the references to W. von Humboldt's work in British media. Marsden did not mention W. von Humboldt in his "Miscellaneous Works", but in Crawfurd's article he was accorded a prominent, albeit limited place; according to Crawfurd the "celebrated Baron William Humboldt" stood out even among the assiduous and diligent Germans, and it was prophesized that "from his pen the public may shortly expect an ingenious, a learned, and a philosophical treatise on the affiliation of the languages in question."<sup>7</sup> As we will see later, Crawfurd would continue to refer to W. von Humboldt in such lauding terms; even when

---

<sup>1</sup> *American Quarterly Review*, p.7.

<sup>2</sup> This text was originally a paper read before the Philological Society by Dr. Hodgkin; later it appeared in print both as an independent publication and in the *London and Edinburgh Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*. The Philological Society of London was not officially founded until 1842, but, as H. Aarsleff mentioned, a more informal congregation bearing the same name (and consisting of the later foundational members) did exist already some ten years before then. (Aarsleff 1966/1983, pp.177-178, 211-215, & 221-224)

<sup>3</sup> T. Hodgkin was, like J.C. Prichard, a Quaker by faith and a physician by training (both studied at the University of Edinburgh where also Quakers were allowed to take a degree). (Stocking 1973, pp.xvii-xviii) In the field of medicine he is probably most renowned for the disease named after him. (See Porter 1997, pp.315 & 481) On Hodgkin's work as an ethnologist and his reputation as a social reformer and philanthropist, and in this context the pivotal role he played in establishing the APS and later the Ethnological Society of London, see Stocking 1971, pp.369-375; Stocking 1987, pp.240-45; Ellingson, pp.240-241; Cantor, pp.133-138; Kenny, esp. pp.368-372; and Heartfield, pp.9-85. For more on the relations between Prichard and Hodgkin, see also Augstein 1996 and Augstein 1999.

<sup>4</sup> Lang was very frequently referred to in *Hodgkin 1835*, pp.9-18.

<sup>5</sup> *Hodgkin 1835*, p.9.

<sup>6</sup> *Hodgkin 1835*, p.15.

<sup>7</sup> *Crawfurd 1834a*, p.373.

disagreeing with his hypothesis and theoretical approach, Crawford would never invoke the denigrating discourse which he otherwise often did. The article in the *American Quarterly Review* followed in the same vein; lamenting the recent demise of that “eminent statesman and scholar”, it was predicted that this unhappy event would “retard our progress towards the solution of the various problems involved in this great and interesting subject” which he so laboriously pursued.<sup>1</sup> This unconditional admiration of German philology was not restricted to W. von Humboldt; it did, on the contrary, constitute a general trend in Great Britain where the initial head start, associated with Sir W. Jones’s studies and the work done in the Asiatic Society in Calcutta, had soon been reached and eclipsed by the philological studies done on the continent and especially within the German universities. Not only W. von Humboldt but also F. Bopp, the Grimm brothers, and the Dane R. Rask were amongst those whose work was praised as superior in terms of scholarly erudition and scientific diligence to anything produced in the British Isles.<sup>2</sup>

On behalf of his late brother, A. von Humboldt expressed a deep and genuine gratitude to Crawford in the preface to the book length Introduction “Über die Verschiedenheit de menschlichen Sprachbaues” when this was published in 1836. He thus referred to the “new and important material” with which he had supplied his brother; then he concluded that:

“Among the foreign scholars whose communications have particularly enriched this work, pride of place must go to the talented author of the “History of the Indian Archipelago” and the “Embassy to the Court of Ava”, Mr. John Crawford, who, from the great store of his collection of writings in Malayan languages, made freely available to my late brother three manuscript Javanese dictionaries and a handwritten Javanese grammar, as well as a copy of the aforementioned Kawi epic. In view of the inadequacy of all published guidance, it would have been impossible, without this information, to gain full mastery of Javanese and Kawi language in all their peculiarities.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *American Quarterly Review*, p.16.

<sup>2</sup> This aspect of reverence and corresponding notion of own inferiority has been dealt with in Aarsleff 1966/1983, ch.5, esp. pp.179-181; see also Burrow 1967, and the topic was also touched upon in e.g. ch.1 in Alter 1999, and Benes 2008, pp.211-221. For an example of a contemporary articulation of this perceived inferiority, see Hodgkin 1827; here Hodgkin lamented that “this science [i.e. *ethnography* or *linguistics*] is so little cultivated in this country, that we believe not even the names applied to it on the continent are here known beyond the narrow circle of a few learned societies”, and Hodgkin continued on how, deservedly, “our continental neighbours impute to us ignorance of logic, and neglect of systematic arrangement, in our scientific and philosophical writings.” (Hodgkin 1827, pp.378 & 379)

<sup>3</sup> Quoted in Humboldt 1836, Vol.I, p.ix. (the English translation is found in Humboldt 1988, pp.3-4) A. von Humboldt continued: “Mr. Crawford, whose personal acquaintance I first came to enjoy in Paris, will assuredly accept this expression of gratitude from both brothers with the same goodwill which led him to provide such important materials, collected entirely by his own industry, for profitable use.” See also J.C.E. Buschmann’s foreword in Humboldt 1838, Vol.II (pp.ix-x) for a similar expression of unconditional gratitude to Crawford and his liberality by putting these native manuscripts and other unpublished material (grammars and dictionaries in particular) at Humboldt’s, and later Buschmann’s own, free disposal.

Notwithstanding all this appraisal, Crawford's contribution was thus presented as primarily consisting of providing otherwise unobtainable source-material. That is, as just another information gatherer,<sup>1</sup> if we should use the terminology that has been applied throughout this study, although his feats as knowledge producer were actually recognized at times throughout Humboldt's text.<sup>2</sup> Still, most of the references to Crawford or his texts throughout the three volumes of "Über die Kawi Sprache auf der Insel Java" alluded to him in this capacity, and it often it appeared in conjunction with Raffles's name.<sup>3</sup>

This example amply illustrates the point that, rather than constituting two self-contained categories, *information gathering* and *knowledge production* are relationally defined; hence, as demonstrated in this example, one's knowledge producer could be another one's information gatherer, if only the contextual circumstances were changed.

## **2.2 The Intertextual Entanglements.**

### **2.2.1 A Swan Song: Marsden's Last Disquisition.**

Marsden's discourse remained remarkably stable over the years. Since 1811-1812 it may have become more extensive in its geographical scope, and it had definitely incorporated a large amount of new empirical material that was not available before; the fundamental approach, however, appeared unaltered and its main tenets did not undergo any changes either. More interesting to our purpose, perhaps, is the fact that Marsden by now, in 1834, offered a detailed response to the reservations and veiled critique that Crawford had ushered in HIA. This engagement with Crawford's text allowed Marsden to refurbish his old arguments and to bolster these with evidence derived from the more recent empirical material – even though C.E. Meinicke deplored that he did not include many of the results obtained by during the more recent French and Russian voyages to these regions.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> These references were almost innumerable in Humboldt's work. W. von Humboldt's biographical and bibliographical networks of linguistic information gathering and exchanges of philological knowledge have been extensively mapped in *Reutter*, pp.30-416 where all his quotations and references are identified and classified.

<sup>2</sup> As, for instance, in the example referred to earlier in this chapter (in "Humboldt 1836, vol.I, p.vii (p.15 in Humboldt 1988). Or, as when it was stated that: "Crawford's Arbeiten gehen theils in ganz einzelne Gegenstände noch tiefer und genauer ein, theils aber verbreiten sie sich über ein grösseres Feld, und überall ist in seinen Werken ein kritisches und philosophisches Streben sichtbar, zu sicheren allgemeinen Resultaten zu gelangen." (Humboldt 1836, Vol.I, p.6; my italics) Or when Humboldt, on the following page, contrasted Raffles' historiographical method (with its close reading of- and its prima facie reliance on- the historiographical content contained in the Javanese manuscripts) with Crawford's more 'rigorously critical' approach. (Humboldt 1836, vol.I, p.7)

<sup>3</sup> Especially the first two volumes (vol.I "Über die Verbindungen zwischen Indien und Java." and vol.II containing the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> books ["Über die Kawi-Sprache" and the first two parts of "Über den Malayischen Sprachstamm"; vol.III dealt with the eastern branch of the Malayan language stock, or the South Sea languages) were replete with references to Crawford. In particular the first volume relied almost exclusively on material provided by texts written by Crawford or Raffles; quotations or references to Crawford thus occurred at least once on 151 of the 309 text pages in vol.I.

<sup>4</sup> In particular Meinicke emphasised the information and knowledge provided by Chamisso. (Meinicke, column 64)

In this context Marsden's rhetorical strategy seemed to consist in reinvigorating an old debate, viz. the one he had engaged in with Leyden. According to Marsden, Leyden's ghost seemed linger on – but by now it was in the shape of the ideas and theories held by the late Leyden's compatriot, Crawfurd. Marsden thus saw a string of continuity between these two, and he intimated that Leyden's ideas had in Crawfurd's discourse finally become materialized in the form that they probably originally were meant to have had by Leyden himself. Marsden thus claimed that Crawfurd's HIA “may serve as a commentary for explaining what as probably meant, though obscurely expressed by the preceding writer [i.e. Leyden].”<sup>1</sup>

Whether Marsden were right in this assertion, and thus in ascribing Crawfurd the role as Leyden's proxy, is probably debatable; at least Crawfurd himself did not seem to think so. On the contrary, Leyden's name, for instance, appeared extremely rarely in HIA, and Marsden was mentioned, as well as followed, far more often.<sup>2</sup> It would thus have been fairly easy to dismiss this comparison as an eccentric whim of an old, and perhaps somewhat feeble, mind, if it was not for the stubborn fact that this comparison kept popping up in references to these matters in various texts throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> C.. Hence it becomes necessary to take this association seriously, however far fetched it may appear at first sight; the epistemic configurations, intellectual associations, and political alliances postulated back then – whether chosen by the actor himself or insinuated by an opponent – played a crucial role in the heterogeneous manners in which the texts were received, read, and enacted upon.

Even though Crawfurd's critique of Marsden in HIA was more implicit than overt and had to be teased out of the text, it can be safely asserted that both Leyden and Crawfurd agreed in their opposition to Marsden's stringent use of the genealogical model. This was in particular evident in their shared emphasis on the fundamentally hybrid nature of some of the ‘cultivated’ languages like Malay. These were perceived as the outcome of a continuous historical process, as resulting from the dissemination of- and interaction between different languages, civilizations, and cultures within a restricted coastal space. It was precisely this notion of linguistic hybridity that Marsden assailed most insistently; at its very core it defied Marsden's own approach to language and the interpretive framework into which it was later inscribed and invoked as ‘evidence’.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Marsden 1834*, p.12. Marsden would then, in accompanying footnote, elaborate on apparent lack of empirical material at Leyden's disposal; combined with the restricted time-frame, in which his work was conducted (even when alive), this “was not sufficient to give him a competent knowledge, and accordingly the Malayan part of at least his ‘Comparative Vocabulary of Barma, Maláyu, and T'hái (Siamese) languages’ is very erroneous.” This was despite Marsden's acknowledgment of Leyden being “endowed with genius in no common degree, and as a linguist [he] was remarkable for the quickness with which he acquired a language.”

<sup>2</sup> Leyden is thus seemed to have been mentioned only twice in HIA (both references to Malay literature in Vol.II, pp.47 & 49), whereas Marsden figured often, both as reliable provider of credible data and as the most prominent theorist whom Crawfurd either followed or discussed with without, however, demonstrating any form of irreverence. On the latter aspect, and in a linguistic context, see e.g. Vol.II, p.81 and p.99.

Against Crawford's linguistic theory, with its assumption of *linguistic polygenism* and the hypothesized *great Polynesian language* which supposedly was disseminated together with the *great Polynesian civilization*, Marsden employed evidence drawn both from linguistic and from racial data, as well as he sought refuge in a set of basic scientific principles. Once again Marsden reiterated that "a proportion of the words, and [in particular] those of the simplest nature, are found to be same in all";<sup>1</sup> this recourse to the methodology of the word list<sup>2</sup> pointed to an undeniable genealogical affinity between the languages. Even when no apparent similarity could be found between the words, Marsden cautioned that "the *effects of distance in respect to time and space* should be taken into account; and where this is evidently so great [as in this instance!], *a partial difference of words cannot be urged as proof of the want of original identity of language.*"<sup>3</sup>

And he flatly rejected the argument regarding the linguistic diversity among the *Negritos*<sup>4</sup> as providing evidence in support of an original linguistic diversity, and perhaps even linguistic polygenism, in the region. Without much elaboration he claimed that the two cases were incompatible, and Crawford's inclusion of these peoples in his analytical framework represented a captious attempt to draw "a confusion of things that ought to be kept entirely distinct".<sup>5</sup>

But before then he had also raised serious doubts about the scientific nature of Crawford's mode of argumentation; the linguistic distribution that Crawford claimed to explain with his "complex hypothesis",<sup>6</sup> postulating an original linguistic diversity upon which the unifying elements of the great Polynesian language had later been superimposed, could, according to Marsden, be explained easier by his own, allegedly, simpler hypothesis of genealogical descent. In such an event of two hypotheses explaining (exactly) the same phenomena, the principle of Occam's razor would favour the simplest one. Yet, Crawford would most probably disagree with Marsden regarding whether the two hypotheses did explain exactly the same linguistic phenomena, as well as in what actually constituted explanative simplicity.

However, "existence of such an influential [Great Polynesian] nation of one whose more cultivated language modified, and in some degree superseded those belonging to the several islands, is *imaginary only*"<sup>7</sup>, Marsden objected. Instead, of such a "language supposed to have been propagated through the influence of 'domination and conquest, or of great admixture', is no other

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden 1834, p.14.

<sup>2</sup> Marsden would in this context reiterate the principles upon which his approach was founded, and this time in more precise terms than ever before: "My plan for the comparison of languages has been to adopt a limited number of words, the most simple in their meaning and least liable to misapprehension, to be used as an invariable and therefore impartial standard: and if, upon comparing these lists, a reasonable proportion of their respective terms are found to bear a resemblance to each other, I have then felt justified in considering them as cognate dialects." (Marsden 1834, p.11)

<sup>3</sup> Marsden 1834, p.14; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> To whom Marsden here counted all the black complexioned "Australasian tribes". (Marsden 1834, p.13)

<sup>5</sup> Marsden 1834, p.13.

<sup>6</sup> Marsden 1834, p.13.

<sup>7</sup> Marsden 1834, p.15; the italics are Marsden's own.



than *the proper, original tongue of the earliest light-complexioned population*; and that the portion of it considered by Dr. Leyden and Mr. Crawford as the remnants of a tongue more ancient than the Polynesian, is merely that part of the latter which *has undergone the change that time and accidental circumstance produce in all*, but especially in the unwritten languages, and of which abundant example is afforded in those of the Greeks and Romans.”<sup>1</sup>

Marsden himself hinted that these differences first and foremost should be attributed to the discrepant interpretive frameworks in which they embedded their linguistic research and inscribed its results. Recognizing the impact of Crawford’s linguistic research, Marsden thus granted that “even where I differ from him [Crawford] the most, I feel the weight of his opinions. *In regard to facts, indeed, our differences are unimportant; but in the general conclusions drawn from them, as to the basis of language, we are entirely at issue.*”<sup>2</sup>

Whereas the question regarding the original abode of the Malayan *nation* had been a contested issue in the 1810s, it hardly received any notice in 1834. Marsden thus merely referred to his own earlier writings and repeated that “the original seat of the *orang maláyu* or Malays” was at Sumatra, but it was “indisputable that the Peninsula which bears their name was the country in which they rose to importance as a *nation*, and where their language received those essential improvements to which it is indebted for its celebrity”.<sup>3</sup> Marsden thus once maintained that the Malayan language, in its narrow definition, was *not* “the parent stock from which the other dialects<sup>4</sup> have sprung” and spread as far as to Madagascar and Easter Island. On the contrary, their connexion was one of “sisterhood”, Marsden maintained. However, despite the numerous but superficial alterations that the modern Malay language had received from outer sources (Sanskrit and Arabian), it still belonged to the Polynesian family; according to Marsden, “a comparison of its most simple vocables with those of the less cultivated dialects, with attention to the structure of both, will furnish abundant evidence of their original consanguinity.”<sup>5</sup>

The Malayan language, in its narrow definition, thence originated with the birth of the Malayan *nation*, and it had gradually been refined throughout the history of this nation and the development of a specific *culture* of its own, profoundly influenced by both Indian and Arabic language and civilization. The Malayan language broadly defined, or the Polynesian language as Marsden continued to label it, on the other hand, testified to the *racial bonds* of consanguinity which

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden 1834, p.15; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Marsden 1834, p.12; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Marsden 1834, pp.15-16; the italicisation of *nation* is mine.

<sup>4</sup> Marsden seemed here to use term *dialect* to denominate the different *languages* pertaining to the same stock or language family. in casu (Malayo-)Polynesian.

<sup>5</sup> Marsden 1834, p.8. My italics.

ultimately bounded this huge region, spanning from Madagascar to Easter Island, together. Even if Marsden may only have used the term ‘consanguinity’ in a loose and metaphorical sense, rather than stressing its literal meaning, it still, nonetheless, appeared to intimate a causal connection between language and race, even though this connection remained only tacitly implied.

While the Malayan question received only little attention by now, Madagascar had become the new hotspot of contention in these discourses. For the first time Marsden addressed in any depth the question of the connections between the languages spoken on Madagascar and in the Malayan Archipelago. Acknowledging that such a connection was highly remarkable, Marsden granted that “as the evidence of an affinity between languages should be strong in proportion to the *prima facie* want of probability”;<sup>1</sup> yet the evidence support of such a connection was apparently overwhelming. Hence, although such a connection had to represent “one of the most extraordinary facts in the history of language”, Marsden still asserted that the linguistic bonds between the two sites were so well proved in a genealogical sense that:

“Nor have we reason to believe it probable, that the language should have been so thoroughly disseminated by the effects of mere commercial intercourse, or the accidental settling there of the crews of tempest-driven praws [prahus] from Sumatra or Java. Such visits have never been productive of a radical change in the language of a great country; and in Madagascar it is remarkably uniform as is proved not only by vocabularies formed on its opposite coasts, but by the direct testimonies of M. Flacourt and Robert Drury, both of whom had ample opportunities of being acquainted with various parts of the island.”<sup>2</sup>

Once more it was a pair of old acquaintances who were consulted as the informative authorities; Meinicke’s criticism of Marsden thus appeared well founded at least in this context. The positive evidence furnished by the profound linguistic resemblances hence seemed to indicate a rather massive migration of Polynesian speaking peoples from the Malayan Archipelago to Madagascar;<sup>3</sup> appealing to an indirect analogical reasoning Marsden asserted that anything else would be unthinkable given the nature of the linguistic evidence. In addition to this, he here invoked his African knowledge and provided some negative racial and linguistic evidence when he stated that “this tongue [i.e. the Malagasy], where it differs the most from the Polynesian, does not bear any resemblance whatever to that of Mozambique or others on the opposite coast of Africa. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Marsden 1834, p.33; the languages spoken on Madagascar were analysed and discussed on pp.31-35.

<sup>2</sup> Marsden 1834, p.32.

<sup>3</sup> Based on geographical proximity and on linguistic similarity, Marsden conjectured “an original connection” between P. Nias (situated on the western coast of Sumatra) and Madagascar as the most probable one. (Marsden 1834, p.33)

complexion of the people also is much less dark, and their hair is not woolly, but comparatively long, with a natural tendency to curl.”<sup>1</sup>

Marsden thus emphasized the Polynesian provenance of the inhabitants, the language, and, it appears, the civilization too on Madagascar. Just as important as what Marsden explicitly wrote was, however, what he did not state; the text thus contained no references whatsoever to a two-race theory or to a displacement narrative in accounting for the presence of a Polynesian language on Madagascar. Marsden’s last text on these issues hence seemed to represent the last attempt at approaching these themes from a purely linguistic angle; only in the one abovementioned instance (when it neatly fitted his own agenda!) did Marsden actually refer to racial features – otherwise he remained remarkably silent on the issue of the racial composition of the population of Madagascar.

### **2.2.2 Crawford’s Course from Polynesia to Oceania.**

The article Crawford published in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* ushered, as I have already argued extensively elsewhere, a new approach in Crawford’s studies of this region. Although this anonymously authored article has hardly received any attention from historians, it did represent the greatest change in Crawford’s geographical, historical, linguistic, and ethnological outlook. Borrowing the notion of Oceania from contemporary French studies, it introduced a new geographical scope, and this was inscribed into a universal framework of civilizations demarcated by racial and linguistic boundaries; whereas he soon abandoned the former, the latter would in time become a leitmotif in Crawford’s ethnological discourses – especially his articles from the 1860s abound in examples of this approach. It was here that he for the first time suggested the existence of three different races in the region instead of two. He also abandoned the idea of a great Polynesian language and substituted it with a sort of ‘cluster theory’ of the dissemination of language and civilization; the function of Javanese and Malay replaced that formerly ascribed to the Great Polynesian civilization emanating from the same centre at Java. All these themes have already been discussed at length and need not detain us any further here.

The question regarding the seat of origin of the Malayan *nation* and language in its narrowest definition was only addressed indirectly by Crawford in this article. Its general agenda seemed more to be a refutation of Marsden’s theory of the genealogical diffusion of languages and subsequently presenting Crawford’s alternative theory, suggesting not only a linguistic polygenism but also intimating the multiple origins of civilization and races. In this context Crawford did not accord much space to a discussion of the origin of the Malay nation. Yet a closer reading allows us at least to grasp the contours of the framework within which this question could have been directly addressed, if Crawford had chosen to do so. In discussing the question whether “an independent

---

<sup>1</sup> *Marsden 1834*, pp.32-33.

civilization had sprung up in some part of the Oceanic region, from which it had spread to other nations belonging to the same race”,<sup>1</sup> Crawford concluded that “one thing is quite certain, that *the civilization of the yellow coloured race is indigenous and not foreign*, as everything material to it is indicated in the native languages, while the influence of Sanscrit, and, in particular, of the Arabic language, may easily be shown to be extrinsic and adventitious, and comparatively unimportant and modern.”<sup>2</sup> In locating the possible seat(s) of origin of such a civilization or civilizations, Crawford identified “the table-land of *Sumatra*, the rich, elevated and open valleys of *Java*, and the great island of *Luconia*, which possesses open plains, a fertile soil and a favourable climate, appear to us to be the *most propitious – indeed the only probable – spots for the foci of such civilization.*”<sup>3</sup> Again we encounter the idea of Menangkabau as a seat of origin for a civilization – the one which in both earlier and later writings was identified as the original abode of the Malayan *nation*.

In determining the racial affiliations of the peoples who created those civilizations in the Oceanic region, Crawford once more dismissed any essential influence from the outside. Crawford’s racial theories and his hypotheses regarding the autochthonous origins of both the *Negrito* and the *Third Race* has been analysed in Part I,<sup>4</sup> and the absence of any racial linkages between the *yellow-complexioned race* inhabiting the region and the rest of the world was also adamantly insisted upon; neither could they possibly have been of Indo-Chinese (“Hindoo-Chinese”), Chinese, American, Hindu, or Persian origin.<sup>5</sup> Instead the conclusion was clear:

“The three races then must be concluded to be aboriginal; and when we are reduced to adopt this position, we are certainly in no worse situation than when we attempt to trace the migrations of the old inhabitants of any other quarter of the globe. The races of the Oceanic islands are peculiar, like those inhabiting Europe, or Africa, or America. An indigenous and independent civilization has sprung up among them, and in the course of many ages this civilization has been gradually, widely, and silently spread, in the manner in which we have endeavoured to explain. History, of course, makes no mention of the changes which this civilization has effected, because a people so rude have no history. The outmost length to which we can carry back the annals of the more civilized nations of the region does not exceed six centuries, and even to this length we can only proceed with the aid of medals and monuments. It by no means follows, however, that the Oceanic nations, and even their

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.385.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.385; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.385; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> See also Crawford 1834a, pp.405-407 for Crawford’s own discussion hereof.

<sup>5</sup> Whereas a racial linkage to the Hindus, Persians, and Arabs was deemed impossible due differences in *physical form*, and “the idea of Chinese or Tartar origin is too ridiculous to deserve a moment’s consideration”, both the American and the Indo-Chinese racial connections were primarily dismissed on account of an allegedly essential linguistic disparity. (Crawford 1834a, pp.405-406)

civilization, are not of very considerable antiquity; and we shall, probably, not mislead ourselves if we ascribe a period of several thousand years as having elapsed between their emerging from the savage state, and the time in which they are first mentioned in history.”<sup>1</sup>

Crawfurd thus intimated that human history in this region spanned at least several thousand years even before they entered the historical phase; as such he seemed rather close to also directly challenge the temporal framework authorised in the Bible,<sup>2</sup> and which in this context had been interpreted in its most orthodox way by J.D. Lang, whereas Marsden carefully avoided taking any stance on this matter.

Madagascar was not accorded much space in this article, but Crawfurd did here for the first time offer some explanation of the relations between this island and the rest of the vast archipelago, as well as he proposed a conjecture regarding the route and manner in which this connection was established. Acknowledging the undeniable existence of some words exhibiting a striking similarity with those used in the Indian Archipelago – and which testified to a uni-directional exchange of language, ideas, and objects (most notably that of rice) – Crawfurd ascribed this influence to the effect of a few native tempest-driven prahus, caught adrift and carried hither by the prevailing currents and winds.<sup>3</sup> Although such events must have happened many times over the years, the connection thus established was merely accidental, never essential. In arguing this case Crawfurd invoked both linguistic and racial evidence. The number of shared words was rather limited, and, in explicit opposition to Marsden’s theory, Crawfurd claimed that these shared words were never *radical* in his sense of this term; on the contrary, they belonged to the category of words “such as men would *naturally* adopt in the progress of improvement, or such as all languages are liable to receive through caprice or accident”.<sup>4</sup> It was *civilization* that was disseminated, not a diffusion of *national* affinities. Crawfurd corroborated this assessment by referring to the racial composition of the population on Madagascar; this was, in Crawfurd’s words, “in reality a Negrito, or at least a

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd 1834a, pp.406-407.

<sup>2</sup> For more on this revolution in ethnological time, see in particular T.R. Trautmann’s informed article on “The Revolution in Ethnological Time” (Trautmann 1992), where he argued that “the decisive event for the formation of anthropology as we know it was not Darwinism strictly, but rather the revolution in ethnological time.” (p.380) First viewing this event as a decisive break, a moment of rupture, Trautmann then subsequently approached it within a framework of continuity, of a slow, yet steady advance towards a radically new way of viewing mankind and its history – it from this latter vantage point that the controversial in Crawfurd’s intimation should be perceived. See also Stocking 1987, esp. pp. 69-74. For a discussion of the different temporal frameworks in early 19<sup>th</sup> C. natural and human history, their interaction and seclusion, see also ch.6 in Gould 1987, as well as M. Rudwick’s meticulous studies (Rudwick 2005 & Rudwick 2008)

<sup>3</sup> Based on linguistic evidence, combined with the relative geographical proximity, Crawfurd suggested Acheen or Pulo Nias as the most probable places from whence such boats could have arrived. (Crawfurd 1834a, p.405)

<sup>4</sup> Crawfurd 1834a, p.405; my italics.

Negro race”,<sup>1</sup> seemingly undiluted by any racial influences from the more eastern parts of the Oceanic region.

Rather than advancing a two race theory and invoking the familiar displacement narrative, like suggested by Chamisso and Malte-Brun, Crawford perceived the connections between Madagascar and the eastern parts of the archipelago as so haphazard and random that the migrating part would have become racially absorbed, despite leaving linguistic vestiges still present in the languages spoken on Madagascar and imparting upon these societies a certain degree of civilization.

### **2.2.3 Lang’s Original Malays: The Founders of Southeast Asian Civilization.**

Like Crawford, Lang was also quite aware of Marsden’s “Miscellaneous Works” published the same year,<sup>2</sup> and just like him he also had his reservations about some aspects of Marsden’s approach. Yet he distanced himself even further from Crawford’s theoretical approach and hypothesis. Pairing Crawford up with Leyden, Lang dismissed in unequivocal terms what he perceived as how “these gentlemen have supposed that there must have been *some general language more ancient and more widely diffused* than either the Polynesian, the Malayan, or any of the other dialects of the isles”.<sup>3</sup> Lang followed Marsden’s approach in this criticism, although the idea of “some general language” obviously was a clear misconception of Crawford’s polygenetic theory of language.

Yet neither he acquiesce to Marsden’s hypothesis. In this Lang found that “Mr. Marsden, however, has some delicate and scarcely intelligible distinctions of his own, where there appear to me to be no differences in nature or in fact.”<sup>4</sup> Operating with a strictly genealogical framework, Lang’s interpretation nonetheless deviated from Marsden’s in one crucial aspect: whereas Marsden explicitly had stressed that the Malay language in the narrow definition was *not* “the parent stock from which the other dialects have sprung”, but on the contrary a sister language to others in the region,<sup>5</sup> Lang seemed to be of exactly the opposite opinion – that the *original language* from whence all other Polynesian languages (and ultimately all Amerindian languages too!) sprang was the Malayan language. Not as it appeared in its modern form, replete with Sanskrit vocables and terms of Arabian provenance, but in its assumed original form. “The skeleton of the language – its bones and sinews, so to speak, – consists of the ancient Malayan or Polynesian tongue.”<sup>6</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1834a, p.405.

<sup>2</sup> Lang thus referred to this work several times throughout his book, besides at times quoting at length from it; see e.g. Lang, pp.v-vi, 18, 19, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, & 38.

<sup>3</sup> Lang, pp.31-32; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Lang, pp.32-33.

<sup>5</sup> Marsden 1834, p.8.

<sup>6</sup> Lang, p.25.

organicist analogy invoked here was by no means coincidental; it reflected the congruent nature of language and race assumed in Lang's discourse.<sup>1</sup>

The discrepancy between Marsden and Lang was rooted in more than mere semantics; it was not just a question of whether this *original language* in the region should be denominated (proto) Polynesian, or an original form of Malay. It also concerned the nature of the people who spoke this language and the kind of society in which they lived. Lang, like both Marsden and Crawford, had identified locations like Menangkabau and Java as ancient "headquarters and nurseries of their race",<sup>2</sup> but the general tenor of Lang's discourse differed decisively from Marsden's; Lang thus spoke of both an ancient Malayan *Empire* and a Malayan *nation*, the grandeur of which was only vaguely glimpsed in the declined Malayan nation encountered by the Europeans in the 16<sup>th</sup> C.<sup>3</sup> Within Lang's degenerationist scheme decline rather than progress was the rule,<sup>4</sup> and the Malayan *empire* or *nation* (Lang seemed to use these terms rather interchangeably) appeared to be of a much older date than the era which Marsden, Raffles, and Crawford had identified as the origin of the Malayan *nation*.<sup>5</sup> Indeed it seemed to represent the *original state* of affairs in the region according to Lang. This implied that the aspects of *language*, *race*, *nation*, and *civilization* were inextricably interwoven, if not outright overlapping; they all testified to the fact that the earliest inhabitants in the region had established a Malayan empire which later evolved into a Malay nation, and from which the peopling of not only the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia but the entire Americas proceeded.

The origins of this founding Malayan empire could then be traced, as well linguistically as racially, back to the Asian mainland. Unlike Marsden and in opposition to Blumenbach, Lang viewed the linguistic and the racial relations between the Asian mainland (and especially China) and the Indian Archipelago within the framework of a gradient continuum. Instead of identifying a typological divide between the monosyllabic Chinese and Indo-Chinese languages on the one hand, and the polysyllabic Polynesian, or Malayan, languages on the other, Lang asserted that "the languages of China, of Japan, and of the various other nations of Tartar origin inhabiting India

---

<sup>1</sup> As it was most explicitly articulated in his analysis of the 3 global language *stocks* – these were both named after and coincided with the racial tripartition of the *Mongolian*, *Caucasian*, and *Ethiopian* stocks (Lang, pp.150-159), such as it was contemporaneously championed by Cuvier. (see also *Keevak*, pp.78-79 for Cuvier's description and assessment of the Mongolian race, its defining criteria and characteristics)

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Lang, p.49.

<sup>3</sup> Lang, p.49.

<sup>4</sup> See Lang pp.89-92 for a clear articulation of this stance. ("It is an easy and natural process for man to degenerate in the scale of civilization, as the Asiatics have evidently done in travelling to the northward and eastward.")

<sup>5</sup> See e.g. Lang, pp.209-210 ("In short, there is reason to believe, that the forefathers of the *great Malayan nation* had arrived and settled in Eastern Asia and in the isles adjacent, at a period coeval with the origin and establishment of the Egyptian empire in the west"), and p.227 ("And there is reason to believe, that at a period no less ancient [than the peopling of China mentioned above, and dated to around 2155 BC], or at least shortly thereafter, the *foundations of the Malayan state* were laid, in the regions to the southward [of China] and in the isles of the Indian Archipelago".)

beyond the Ganges, have a *similar parentage with the languages of the Indian Archipelago and of the South Sea Islands*, and that all these languages are traceable to the same ancient mother-tongue of Eastern Asia.”<sup>1</sup> And, furthermore, he concluded “that the line of demarcation, which Professor Blumenbach has attempted to draw between the Mongolian and the Malayan races of mankind, is purely imaginary.”<sup>2</sup> This racial continuity could be extrapolated all the way to the Americas; “the Malay cast of countenance has been detected by intelligent observers among the Indians of America”<sup>3</sup>, and this was corroborated by observable similarities in as well character and habits as in language.<sup>4</sup>

Upon these grounds, Lang claimed that “from the *peculiar character of their ancient civilization*, from the *manners and customs* of their uncivilized tribes, and from the general *structure and analogies of their language*, I conceive we are warranted to conclude that the Indo-Americans *are the same people* as the South Sea Islanders, the *Malays* of the Indian Archipelago, and the Indo-Chinese nations of Eastern Asia; and that the continent of America was originally peopled from the scattered islands of the Pacific.”<sup>5</sup>

The Malayan empire thus constituted a crucial steppingstone in this process, facilitating the peopling of a considerable part of the globe and moulding the character and civilization of the societies that these peoples formed. Yet, despite being vividly debated in its time, this notion of an ancient, highly civilized Malay empire proved to be an ephemeral idea. It remained rather marginal to the discourses and modes of knowledge production otherwise discussed here; its speculative nature and the strictly Scriptural framework rendered it of only little direct applicative value in the colonial contexts; and, furthermore, its author was only a peripheral figure in terms of geography and political agenda.

In this scheme Madagascar occupied a quite insignificant space. Admitting that the settlement of that island most probable had occurred in some very remote past, Lang nonetheless ascribed “the prevalence of the Malayan language in the island of Madagascar” to “the conquest of the Arabs and the voyages of the seafaring converts in the east to the sepulchre of the Arabian prophet”;<sup>6</sup> that is, apparently at a very late date indeed given that Islam did not enter the Indian Archipelago before the first half of the second millennium. Lang did not substantiate this bold postulate by any kinds of

---

<sup>1</sup> Lang, pp.39-40; my italics. The argument is further elaborated on pp.40-48.

<sup>2</sup> Lang, p.48.

<sup>3</sup> Lang, p.136.

<sup>4</sup> Lang, pp.135-36, and for the similarities in language pp.137-150. “With such a variety of presumptive evidences of a general and intimate affinity between the Polynesian and the Indo-European languages, we can only regard the following assertions of Mr. Marsden, in the regard to the language of the South Sea Islands [and their decidedly non-affiliation with the Amerindian languages], as entirely gratuitous and contrary tho the fact.” (p.145)

<sup>5</sup> Lang, p.148; my italics.

<sup>6</sup> Lang, pp.54-55.



evidence, nor did he address the apparent clash of racial and linguistic evidence on that island, and throughout the entire text his interest in Madagascar was negligible.

#### **2.2.4. W. von Humboldt's Grand Synthesis.**

No one probably discussed these issues regarding the origins and interrelatedness of the Malayan language-family, language, nation, race, and civilization more thoroughly, or within a more elaborate conceptual framework, than W. von Humboldt did. Yet the immediate reception of his writings in the British context was to a large extent characterized by silence. His name was often mentioned, as we have seen, but his writings remained remarkably unaddressed. Indeed, in this intellectual environment, where German philology was almost automatically received with awe, the very name of W. von Humboldt seemed actually to carry more weight than his arguments; he was often referred to, yet only rarely discussed. Within this British ethnological discourse he would eventually come to be credited with expressing the roughly same views as those of Marsden; these would then be contrasted to Crawford's theories on the civilization, races, and languages in the Indian Archipelago and the South Seas.<sup>1</sup>

W. von Humboldt discussed the questions of Malayan language, race, civilization, and culture in particular in §1 in his book-length introduction ("On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind"). The content of the remaining part of the 3 large tomes, or roughly 1500 pages, of "Über die Kawi Sprache" were solely dedicated to an analysis of the entwined linguistic relations in the insular space between Madagascar and Easter Island, and to what these relations revealed about the origins, diffusions, and interactions between the races, nations, and civilizations within this and in the neighbouring areas. The first volume dealt with the connections between ancient India and Java; the second contained analyses of the Kawi language and of the part of the Malayan language stock that was spoken within the Indian Archipelago and on Madagascar, as well as it provided a grammatical analysis of all the languages spoken here and in the South Seas; the third continued with an emphasis on the South Sea languages. Most of this was written by W. von Humboldt himself; his sudden demise had, however, prompted von Buschmann to finish this work.<sup>2</sup>

W. von Humboldt used the term Malay in many meanings; on the first few pages of the Introduction he thus operated with both "the peoples of the *Malayan race*",<sup>3</sup> those who could be

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Wallace 1865, p.214; Wallace 1869, p. 30; Cust, pp.13-14 & 141-142; Keane, p.255-256; and Yule, p.300.

<sup>2</sup> Although Buschmann often clearly indicated the parts written by him, the provenance of some parts of the text are, nevertheless, not altogether transparent; yet, this question of who were ultimately responsible for what is not that relevant for our purpose, given that, in the British discourses analysed here, all of its content was generally attributed to Humboldt.

<sup>3</sup> This and the following terms are taken from Peter Heath's English translation of Humboldt's Introduction. W. von Humboldt's own term was "die Völkerschaften des Malayischen Stammes". (Humboldt 1836, vol.I, p.I) Humboldt

“called Malayan in the *narrower sense*”, a “*more strictly Malayan speech-community*”, and that in the Pacific – between New Zealand, Easter Island, Hawaii, and the Philippines<sup>1</sup> – “there dwells an island population betraying *the most unmistakeable marks of ancient blood-relationship with the Malayan races* [in the narrower sense of the term!].”<sup>2</sup> Language played the most prominent part in devising and identifying these groups, even in the case where the presence of an “ancient blood-relationship” was inferred. Biology was not altogether ignored, however, and, as in Marsden’s and Crawford’s discourses, it formed the basis for the fundamental distinction between the “Negritos”, or “Austral Negroes”, on the one hand and the “light-brown races” or Malaysans on the other; to these a third race, as asserted by Crawford, should perhaps be added.<sup>3</sup>

*Civilization*, or *culture* as W. von Humboldt often denominated it, remained an integrated part of the analysis. This confusion of words did not, however, seem to give rise to any confusion amongst the contemporary British readers of Humboldt’s work; Erskine Perry would thus, in his translation of the first parts of §1 of the Introduction, rather consistently translate Humboldt’s references of culture to *civilization*.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the fundamental rationale for W. von Humboldt’s study was: “Consideration of the connection that links *linguistic diversity and the distribution of peoples with the growth of man’s mental power*, as a process that gradually develops in varying degrees and novel forms – so far as the two phenomena can throw mutual light on each other – that will occupy me in these introductory discussions.”<sup>5</sup> Although the gradual development of “man’s mental power” did not exactly equate the stadial growth of civilization (both mental and material), the two phenomena were, nonetheless, intimately connected. Within the universalist framework of stadial evolution of civilization, this growth of mental power represented the potential for civilizational development, and linguistically it became materialized and stratified within a hierarchy of national tongues, each being characterized by its typological form and with the inflectional languages,

---

defined the *Malayan race* as: “I include under this name, along with the population of Malacca, the inhabitants of all the islands of the great southern ocean, *whose languages belong to one and same stock* with that called Malayan in the narrower sense, on Malacca”. (*Humboldt 1988*, p.11; my italics) Thence this relationship was primarily demarcated by a linguistic criterion.

<sup>1</sup> That is, composed of what French geographers at roughly the same time baptized Polynesia and Micronesia, without, apparently, distinguishing between these two parts.

<sup>2</sup> *Humboldt 1988*, p.12; my italics. (“die unverkennbarsten Spuren alter Stammverwandschaft”, *Humboldt 1836*, vol.I, p.II) Erskine Perry did also translate this with a blood-relation (“who display most unquestionable traces of an old connection in blood with the Malays”, *Perry*, p.244)

<sup>3</sup> *Humboldt 1988*, p.15. Humboldt would here actually use the term “eine dritte Race” (*Humboldt 1836*, vol.I, p.VII).

<sup>4</sup> This translation can be found in *Perry*, pp.243-252. In the part translated by Perry, Humboldt himself used the term ‘Civilisation’ and its derivatives on several occasions, and with roughly the same meaning vested in the term as could be encountered in the British discourses; but when he referred to “Indische Cultur”, “Culturverhältnissen” and “Culturgrad” (*Humboldt 1836*, vol.I, pp.viii.,x, xiii, & xv), these were all rendered into civilization by Perry (*Perry*, pp.247, 249, 250, & 252). The only exception was apparently the reference to “the state of culture” (p.246) (“Culturzustand”). However, it seems that in most of instances where Perry’s actually used of the term *culture*, this was a translation of “bildung”, as when Perry spoke of “races susceptible of culture” (“bildungsfähiger Völker”), “mental culture” (“geistige bildung”), or “mental cultivation” (“Geistesbildung”)

<sup>5</sup> *Humboldt 1988*, p.22. My italics.

including the Indo-European languages and in particular Sanskrit, representing the apex of evolution.<sup>1</sup> In this respect the mental power and its linguistic materialization could be perceived as a necessary condition- and a synecdoche for the growth of civilization per se. Yet, W. von Humboldt was also renowned for his insistence on the fundamental particularity of each language, and for his idea on how each language is invariably both the product of- and produces its own world view (Weltansicht or Weltanschauung);<sup>2</sup> This context, with its emphasis on the “novel forms” of the mental power and language,<sup>3</sup> was more directed towards a notion of *culture*;<sup>4</sup> as such it usually appeared supplementary, or metonymically subordinate, to the notion of civilization, rather than being posing as a counter-concept.

*History* was instrumental in accounting for the entangled relations between the languages, races, and nations, as well as in explaining the influence that these had exerted upon the introduction, nature, and growth of civilization within this geographical context. The most crucial element was the question of the nature and extent of the Indian influence on especially the Malayan (in its narrowest sense) and Javanese societies, a theme that would occupy all of first volume of text; “nowhere else”, W. von Humboldt mused, “perhaps, do we find a second example of a *nation* [the Malay] that, without surrendering its independence,<sup>5</sup> has been permeated to this degree by the mental cultivation of another.” This influence, which had caused “more a moral change, however, than a political one”,<sup>6</sup> spurred two other, “deep-lying questions, evoked by factual circumstances,

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Benes 2008*, pp.58-60, and *Aarsleff 1988*, esp. p.xxxii – “The diversity, however, is drawn from the postulated varieties of mental energies among language-making nations, and their languages *are not considered merely in light of their abilities to serve the needs of their cultures, but measured on the absolute scale of Sanscrit. The result is not linguistic relativism but absolutism.* Furthermore, it seems inescapable that the merits of the of the language themselves are prejudged by already formed opinion about the level of culture and civilization of the nations that speak them; in that perspective the argument merely confirms what was already postulated; inferior nations have inferior languages and their inferiority is prior to the languages.” My italics)(For a scathing review of Aarsleff’s interpretation of Humboldt, his philosophical sources and philological predecessors, see *Joseph*, pp.90-93) Although Humboldt, according to T. Benes, “rejected the notion that race, skin colour, physical build, or physiognomy had an impact the development of national tongues”, she admitted that his theories at some level did imply a *racialist dimension* given “his notion that an inborn national character could be an original cause of linguistic variation”, and hence also ultimately of civilizational differences. (*Benes 2008*, p.57) Within the historiography which have seen Humboldt’s philosophy of language as a forerunner of the Sapir-Whorf thesis, this universalist aspect has often been ignored, or at least quite underestimated.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of this aspect and the use(s) of these different terms, see e.g. *Koerner 1992* and ch.7 in *Underhill*.

<sup>3</sup> In Humboldt’s linguistic philosophy language and thought could not be separated; “Humboldt’s entire view of the nature of language is founded on the conviction that thinking and speaking, thought and language form so close a union that we must think them as being identical, in spite of the fact that we can separate them artificially. Owing to this identity, access to the one of the two will open nearly equal access to the other.” (*Aarsleff 1988*, p.xviii. See also *Paxman 2003*, pp.233-240, and *Benes 2008*, p53.

<sup>4</sup> In our analytical meaning of the term.

<sup>5</sup> As articulated in the keeping of their non-inflectional language type despite the adaptation of so many other linguistic elements from Sanskrit – either directly or through other Indian languages.

<sup>6</sup> Both quotes are from *Humboldt 1988*, p.15. In bolstering this argument, Humboldt took recourse to a counterfactual hypothesis: “If mighty movements of population and great conquests had brought this situation about [*then*] clearer traces of these political events would have been preserved.” And given this was not the case (and assuming that the absence of evidence of such was not merely a result of an absence of looking for it), it could be inferred, as a sort of

but difficult to answer with certainty: [1] whether, that is, *the whole civilization of the archipelago* is entirely of Indian origin? [2] and whether, too, from *a period preceding all literature* and the latest and most refined development of speech, there have existed connections between Sanscrit and the Malayan languages in the widest sense, that can still be demonstrated in the common elements of speech?”<sup>1</sup>

W. von Humboldt, in short, addressed the same questions as those discussed by, and between, Marsden and Crawford; in his quest Humboldt emphasized, perhaps even more than the rest, the methodological and ontological primacy played by language in these researches. “The division of mankind into peoples and races,<sup>2</sup> and the diversity of their languages and dialects, are indeed directly linked with each other, but are also connected with, and dependent upon, a third and higher phenomenon, the *growth of mans mental powers* into ever new and often more elevated forms”<sup>3</sup> Hence, language provided the best access to the past; both to the evolution of civilization and to the convoluted historical trajectories through which the races and nations had interacted. However, it also played a pivotal part in “the shaping of the *nation’s mental power*.”<sup>4</sup> In addition to the Herderian idea of language being expressive of the spirit of the nation, Humboldt added a constructivist dimension:<sup>5</sup> language was not merely expressive of thought, it was constitutive of it.<sup>6</sup> In this aspect Humboldt went far beyond his British contemporaries who did not discuss these more philosophical aspects at all, and in their reception of Humboldt’s writings they chose, by and large, to ignore these aspects. Instead they only addressed those which resembled their own queries regarding the use of language as a provider of historical evidence and regarding the interpretive frameworks which most adequately facilitated such interpretations.

---

*argumentum é silentio*, that such “great movements of population and great conquests” had most probably not taken place – instead subtler forces had been at play.

<sup>1</sup> Humboldt 1988, pp.17-18; my italics. Humboldt refuted the first question: “Nor is it at all evident why a people such as the Malaysians should be denied a social civilization of their own creation... The very capacity of its constituent peoples to assimilate the Hinduism transmitted to them is a proof of this, and still more so the manner in which they nevertheless interwove it with native elements, and almost never allowed the Indian contribution to retain its alien shape. Both would necessarily have been otherwise, if the Indian incursions had encountered these races as raw uncultivated [i.e. uncivilized] savages”. The second one was answered in the affirmative; beneath the cultivated varnish of literature and refined art, Humboldt identified “an influence of Sanscrit upon the languages of the Malayan race” that seemed “to belong to a much earlier period and to different relationships among the peoples concerned.” (p.19)

<sup>2</sup> The terms used in the original for *peoples* and *races* were “Völker und Völkerstämme”. (Humboldt 1836, vol.I, p.XVII)

<sup>3</sup> Humboldt 1988, p.21; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Humboldt 1988, p.21; the italics are Humboldt’s.

<sup>5</sup> I have borrowed these notions of expressionist and constructivist theories of languages (or language elements) from T. Benes; see e.g. Benes 2008, pp.18-21 – later she applied these notions in her analysis of Humboldt’s philosophy of language (pp.54-63)

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Vessey; Aarsleff 1988; and Benes 2008, p.58-59. In opposition to Aarsleff’s focus on the French sources to Humboldt’s theories (pp.xxxii-lxi), Benes stated that “the constructivist aspects of Humboldt’s linguistic philosophy fall just as much within the tradition of German idealism, as they emanate from the legacy of French thought.” (p.54)

In the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. W. von Humboldt had come to represent the diametrically opposite opinion of that advanced by Crawford concerning the origins and nature of people and language spoken on Madagascar. Whereas Crawford, as we have seen, already in 1834 had intimated that the Malayan (or Polynesian) language elements in the Malagasy language were accidental rather than essential, and that they resulted from haphazard encounters with shipwrecked crews from tempest-driven vessels, Humboldt came to be seen as the exponent of the view that the language spoken on Madagascar was in all its essentials a language belonging to the Malayan stock. During the 1850s it seemed to become commonplace to situate these two persons in the van as emblematic of these dichotomic interpretations; Erskine Perry's lengthy review of Crawford's "Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language" was thus structured along these lines, and the part of F. Max Müller's disquisition on "The Classification of the Turanian Languages" that dealt with the Malay languages contained a similar distinction between Crawford's and Humboldt's views.<sup>1</sup> It could also be found in the review of Crawford's "A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries" published in JIA,<sup>2</sup> and, furthermore, it was reiterated by e.g. R.N. Cust, A.H. Keane, and H. Yule some 25 years later.<sup>3</sup>

W. von Humboldt apparently wrote the parts of Madagascar before becoming acquainted with Crawford's article from 1834; at least he did not mention this article at all in his analysis of the Madagascar question, whereas he discussed the few, and at times rather circumstantial, references to Madagascar in HIA at length.<sup>4</sup> In his detailed analysis of the Malagasy language, Humboldt had added new sources of information to the well known, old ones provided by Drury and Flacourt; apart from the abovementioned Humboldt also included a dictionary published by the missionary C.B. Challan (1744-1800) on Isle de France in 1773, manuscripts written by the naturalists R.-P. Lesson (1794-1849) and L.A. Chapelier (1778-1806), and the missionary J. Jeffreys (1794-1825), as well as linguistic information obtained from private correspondence with the famous missionary J.J. Freeman (1794-1851) who in 1835 published a celebrated Malagasy-English dictionary.<sup>5</sup> Yet of more interest in this context is what Humboldt wrote on Crawford's hypothesis, and how he discursively counter-posed his own stance against what he perceived as the natural implications of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Perry (p.254: "As the conclusions drawn by Mr. Crawford are diametrically opposed to those of William von Humboldt"), and Müller 1854, p.412 & pp.413-429.

<sup>2</sup> JIA, New series, Vol.I, pp.291-295 (esp. p.295).

<sup>3</sup> See Cust, pp.144-146; Keane, pp.255-57; and Yule, p.300. For more on Cust's linguistic studies and their epistemic as well as colonial contexts, see Irvine.

<sup>4</sup> Especially in §1-3 in 3<sup>rd</sup> book ("Über den Malayischen Sprachstamm"), 1<sup>st</sup> part ("Stammverwandschaft der Malayischen Sprachen"); that is, in Humboldt 1838, Vol.II, pp.207-220.

<sup>5</sup> Humboldt 1838, vol.II, pp.323-36; in addition to these Humboldt also mentioned B.H. de Froberville (1779-1828), as well as the prominent British colonial administrators R. Farquhar (1776-1830) and A. Johnston (1775-1849) as facilitating the contact to some of these persons or as procuring their manuscripts. (Reutter, esp. pp.188-190 & 214-215.

what Crawford had written. After having bestowed his usual appraisal upon Crawford's approach,<sup>1</sup> Humboldt used the Madagascar question to launch a frontal assault on Crawford's theory on how the well attested linguistic similarities between Madagascar and Easter Island were caused by the dissemination of a *great Polynesian* language and civilization, and which had resulted in having the terms for civilization-indicating entities in common, whilst they were not sharing any words expressing their *simple ideas*.<sup>2</sup> By taking Madagascar as an exemplary case, Humboldt contested the empirical validity of this assertion; it was exactly in the terms expressing the *fundamental concepts* that a similarity could be found.<sup>3</sup> A similarity which hence attested to a genealogical, and thus essential, connection between the languages.<sup>4</sup>

Even though all the peoples on Madagascar spoke one single language pertaining to the Malayan stock,<sup>5</sup> this did not imply that their racial composition was just as homogeneous. On the contrary, Humboldt detected the presence of three races on the island: 1) people from the Arabian stock, and hence belonging to the Caucasian race,<sup>6</sup> who had arrived in rather recent times, 2) brown Malays,<sup>7</sup> and 3) Negroes of African descent.<sup>8</sup> Although he did not dwell much on the history or the ethnological composition on the island, Humboldt nevertheless seemed to have accepted the two-race hypothesis and its accompanying displacement narrative; otherwise it would have been difficult to account for the hegemonic position achieved by a language pertaining to the Malayan stock on this distant island – especially when this was perceived within the context of the linguistic-civilizational hierarchy inherent in Humboldt's linguistic theory.

## 2.3 Concluding Remarks.

As such W. von Humboldt's discourse seemed representative of the multifarious meanings vested in the notions of Malayness in the texts from the 1830s discussed here, even though the actual content of his writings was hardly discussed at all by his British peers. In its fundamental approach it adopted Marsden's genealogical-linguistic framework with its notion of the existence of

<sup>1</sup> For this see e.g. *Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, p.212 ("in seiner gehaltreichen und mit recht sehr geschätzten Geschichte des Indischen Archipelagus", and "Crawford nimmt mit Recht an,") & p.215 ("Crawford verwirft mit Recht")

<sup>2</sup> "dass diese Wörter nicht die Grundbegriffe der Sprache angehen, sondern nur solche Gegenstände betreffen, die vorgerückte Civilisation mit sich bringt, wie z.B. die Zahlwörter" (*Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, pp.212-213)

<sup>3</sup> "Das die Übereinstimmung der Mad. [i.e. Malagasy] und der Asiatischen Inselsprachen in den von Civilisation abhängigen Wörtern liege, ist eine so sonderbare Bahaftung, dass ich sie kaum begreife. Gerade im Gegentheil liegt die Ähnlichkeit recht in den Grundbegriffen." (*Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, p.213)

<sup>4</sup> Humboldt would thus later emphasize how the language on Madagascar in its 'innermost self' belonged to the Malayan stock. in *Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, p.326.

<sup>5</sup> *Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, pp.214 & 326.

<sup>6</sup> Humboldt did apparently not distinguish between Indo-European (Aryan) and Semitic along racial lines in a biological sense! (On these issues and the debates they spurred throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> C., see esp. *Olender*)

<sup>7</sup> Whom he had shortly before described as an 'olive-coloured race'. (*Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, p.207) See also *Keevak* for a discussion of the European ascriptions of skin colour to Asian peoples throughout recent history.

<sup>8</sup> Like Crawford, Humboldt distinguished between African- and Austral Negroes as two essentially different races (*Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, p.215), and they both identified the Negroes on Madagascar as Africans rather than being related to the Negroes in Asia. (*Humboldt 1838*, Vol.II, pp.214)

a large language family diffused from Madagascar to Easter Island, and which had reached “its character most fully and purely evolved in the Tagalic tongue” on the Philippines.<sup>1</sup> Yet, he also had another agenda – as it was amply attested by the intense interest in the intermixture of languages that he demonstrated by rendering the Kawi language the focal point of the entire analysis. Unlike Marsden’s unequivocal primacy of genealogy and Crawford’s blatant dismissal of such, W. von Humboldt targeted his analysis at the contested intersections between genealogical diffusion and stadial civilization, according equal importance to the aspect of autochthonous origin and to that of external influence. The particular spirit of the Malayan nation was reflected by its hybrid language; a hybridity resulting from the adaptation and appropriation of Indian civilization on an aggravated scale by this unique race of people.

All the texts that we have addressed here have in common a continued ascription of a methodological primacy of language, as well as an attention to the interplay between civilization, nation, and race in the formation of the societies in the region and in their historical dynamics. In this they did not differ much from the set texts produced in the 1810s; however, there seemed to have been some changes in the internal dynamics and interrelations between these concepts.

Despite Marsden’s reluctance to engage in a discussion of the influence of biological race in this context, it nevertheless permeated all the other discourses.<sup>2</sup> It undoubtedly figured most prominently in Crawford’s article, but it also lurked beneath the terminologies applied in the other texts, introducing a racialized dimension to their rationale that – even if it did not necessarily appear on the discursive surface – still imbued them with a deeper meaning that prioritized divisional lines drawn according to racial criteria. This was most clearly seen in the polygenetic or ‘quasi-polygenetic’ inclinations inherent in Crawford’s, Lang’s, and W. von Humboldt’s texts.

Even though profoundly committed to a hyper-genealogical framework founded upon Scriptural authority, Lang’s tripartite linguistic typology, and the accompanying assumption of a racial co-extensionality,<sup>3</sup> functioned discursively as a de facto racial divide that even seemed to have originated from a direct divine intervention.<sup>4</sup> W. von Humboldt’s silence on the question regarding monogenesis or polygenesis was in itself, as pointed out by H. Aarsleff, remarkable, given his

---

<sup>1</sup> Humboldt 1988, p.20.

<sup>2</sup> And it was implicitly, yet profoundly present in Marsden’s discourse too, as it has been discussed on earlier occasions. His entire approach was pre-analytically structured along racial lines, given that he before the 1830s had entirely refused to discuss the languages spoken by the Papuans or the Negritos within his analytical context, and in 1834 he still a priori assumed these languages to be unaffiliated with the Polynesian languages without bothering to adduce any evidence in support hereof! Apparently he thought that the burden of proof befell upon those who opined otherwise.

<sup>3</sup> Lang even applied a nomenclature normally associated with racial divisions when he named these three typological divisions of language: (1) a Eastern or *Mongolian* language (including Malayan and the Amerindian languages), (2) a Western or *Caucasian* language, and (3) a Southern or *Ethiopic* language (encompassing the languages spoken both in Africa and by the Negro peoples in Asia and Oceania. (Lang, pp.150-159)

<sup>4</sup> Lang, pp.213-215.

brother's avowed support of the latter and more controversial of these stances.<sup>1</sup> Yet, although he may never have been a fully fledged polygenist, his typological theory of language, with its focus on the crucial importance on the original moment of language formation, introduced the idea of a linguistic hierarchy, while it simultaneously seemed to rule out any possibility of a unilinear trajectory of transition that all the languages would sooner or later undergo! Or, in other words, language had determined the potential for civilization, and from the very beginning not all languages possessed the same potential; hence, crudely put, each society possessed its own particular potential for civilization, determined not by biological race but by language.

Crawfurd had from the very onset assumed a linguistic polygenism and operated with fixed racial categories; in time these gained more prominence in his discourse, and even by 1834 they appeared to be more vested with explanative power than they were in 1820. Race could by now explain linguistic differences and, perhaps, ultimately account for civilizational divides. However, Crawfurd was – as W. von Humboldt reminded us, but which seems to have been quite consistently ignored by later historians – at this moment (and to certain extent throughout his whole career) actually more occupied with civilization than with race.<sup>2</sup>

The polygenetic approach thus seemed to accord greater weight to biology as an explanative factor, especially when accounting for differences in the reached level and the specific formation of civilization. This would inevitably influence the approach to this region's history and the assessment of the character of the present societies. Although many of these traits could be encountered in earlier writings as well, for instance in the shape of the displacement narrative, 1834 can nonetheless be seen as a crucial discursive moment. Before then language was the undisputed discursive *primus inter pares*; both when it came to procuring evidence on the history and present state of the vast region, and when it came to providing the interpretive frameworks in which this evidence was produced and embedded. After 1834 the evidence extracted from language came under increasing pressure from racial evidence in the more biological sense of this term.

This dynamics seemed quite consistent with what could, for instance, be observed in India. The Anglicization debate had here reached its zenith in the 1830s with T.B. Macaulay's notorious "Minute on Education"; this has often been seen as the epitome of a new Anglicist paradigm where native languages, and knowledge to a certain extent too, was written out of the educational agenda

---

<sup>1</sup> Aarsleff 1988, p.xxi.

<sup>2</sup> Humboldt 1838, vol.II, p.215. "Denn es geht aus allem hervor, dass Crawfurd mehr gewicht auf den Unterschied des Culturzustandes, als auf den der Racen, legt."



and curriculum for both colonial administrators and for the Indians who aspired for a civil career.<sup>1</sup> On the one hand this reflected a growing disparagement towards the knowledge ingrained in the Indian languages and its knowledge producers,<sup>2</sup> and as such it was associated with what T.R. Trautmann has labelled *Indophobia*;<sup>3</sup> on the other it expressed an intention of including all the colonial subjects under the, in theory, universalist auspices of liberal imperialism. As T. Koditschek emphasised: “if we read the *Minute* carefully, we must acknowledge that it is also a radical document in its presumption that English and Bengali boys have equal intellectual potential, and that Britain will default on her imperial obligations if she fails to provide the latter with the infrastructural wherewithal to catch up with the former.”<sup>4</sup> Despite its egalitarian, universalist pretensions the whole project remained firmly embedded within a strictly stratified framework where the Anglo-Saxon societies represented the uncontested apex of civilization.<sup>5</sup> And when faced with the challenge of ‘colonial subjects’ actually at times surpassing the British themselves, an insidious racism seemed to be the universal answer.<sup>6</sup> In this sense an increasingly racialized approach was a reaction to the truly levelling implications of the liberal imperialist creed; it provided a seemingly scientifically sanctioned barrier to this undesired trajectory of transition.<sup>7</sup>

Nowhere was this tension more clearly exemplified than in Crawford’s case: from the very onset Crawford had operated with racial categories within his universalist framework of civilization, and he had vested these with a certain significance, for instance, in terms of a racially determined capacity for hard labour, and hence also ultimately in their potential for civilization.<sup>8</sup> However, in time these categories became evermore rigidified and important to his discourse. This could be observed in his travelogues published in the late 1820s, as we have already seen.

Over the years, as accentuated by C. Ballard, “the analytical aperture of the observer’s vision was steadily narrowed by metropolitan theory and the fashion of the times for a harder, more

---

<sup>1</sup> There exist a lot of literature on this topic of Anglicism vs. Orientalist attitudes; I have used *Stokes*, pp.25-47; *Metcalf*, ch.2 (esp. pp.33-35); *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.109-117; *Pennycook*, pp.67-94 (operating with a larger timeframe); and *Macafie*, pp.50-58.

<sup>2</sup> See *Arnold 2004* for a discussion of the racial dimension of the growing denigration of Indians and Indian knowledge.

<sup>3</sup> *Trautmann 1997/2004*, esp. pp.99-130.

<sup>4</sup> *Koditschek 2011*, p.121. For a more thorough discussion of liberal imperialism in an Indian context and its appropriation by Indian intellectuals and politicians throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> C., see also *Bayly 2012* and ch.6 in *Koditschek 2011*.

<sup>5</sup> *Koditschek 2011*, p.149: “For all his ostensible belief in the equality of all races, Macaulay’s romance sent a subliminal message to these Anglo-Saxon readers that they need not negotiate with colonial (or class) others on any terms but their own.”

<sup>6</sup> As C.A. Bayly formulated it: “Disparaging and racist stereotypes became more common in 1830s when expatriates began to face real economic and intellectual competition from Indians. But this was a local rhetoric of exclusion. The distant fulminations of James Mill and the domestic missionaries merely consolidated it; they did not create it.” (*Bayly 1996*, pp.218-219)

<sup>7</sup> That is, the incipient steps towards what M. Adas has termed *the limits of diffusion*; this constituted either an explicitly or implicitly articulated commonplace in most of the later 19<sup>th</sup> C. discussions on the different non-European societies and their (assumed) innate capacities or incapacities for acculturation and civilization. (*Adas*, pp.271-342)

<sup>8</sup> See also ch.4 in *Quilty 2001*.

racialist conception of difference.”<sup>1</sup> This tendency also seemed to permeate Crawford’s arguments when he acted as a paid agent for the Calcutta merchants, and as such participated in the debates on the rights of these merchants in India and in the trade with China<sup>2</sup> – even though some of these merchants actually were Indians with whom he closely interacted, such as it could be seen in Desh-U-Lubun Ocharik’s printed response to Crawford’s two pamphlets on “The View of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Free Trade and Colonization of India”<sup>3</sup> and in the letter that Rammohan Roy’s wrote to him.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Douglas & Ballard, p.178.

<sup>2</sup> For more on this, see Stokes, e.g. pp.6 & 130; Greenberg, ch.7; and Hillemann, pp.171-187.

<sup>3</sup> This text was published in two editions – the first in 1828 and an enlarged one the subsequent year (*Crawford 1828b* & *Crawford 1829b*). In 1830 a German translation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition was published in Leipzig; this translation, Ocharik’s commentaries, and the frequent references to it in Britain itself testify to its rather cogent impact in its own time. It was thus reviewed and discussed at length in such important periodicals as the *Edinburgh Review* (1828 (48:96), pp.312-347), the *Quarterly Review* (1828 (38), pp.489-503), the *Westminster Review* (1829 (11), pp.36-353), as well as being intensely discussed over several issues of such specialised journals as the *Oriental Herald* and *Journal of General Literature* and especially in the *Asiatic Journal* and *Monthly Register*. And in Calcutta Ocharik used almost 100 pages to question Crawford’s sweeping generalisation with its seamless equation between free trade and progress of civilization: “But, above all, let not the free-traders or their views decide for us” (p.47); “so that you will clearly perceive we are not yet quite resolved to concur with you in blaming Parliament, nor in scoffing at our masters for not handing over our fields and possessions to be converted into experimental plantations, for the exclusive gratification of speculators and adventurers from London, Liverpool, and Glasgow”. (p.7) Ocharik did this, however, without challenging the ‘civilizing mission’ of the British in India and India’s subordinate position within the Empire: “No one acquainted with our ancient history and government, can deny, that, however many of us may complain of the loss of dignities and immunities formerly, but precariously, possessed, the mass of our people have derived many substantial advantages from the British connexion, which has not only rescued us from the numerous evils which we suffered, under our native rule, but has gradually led to our incorporation as a part of the British empire, to the diffusion of literatures among us, the introduction of a knowledge of the sciences, and the benefit of equal laws, and a distribution of justice similar to that enjoyed by the parent state.” (p.46) Instead Ocharik advocated a tariff protected imperial market (p.47 & p.77), and an India governed along Orientalist principles instead of intending a Utilitarian levelling of cultural difference through jurisprudence and governance (pp.67-68), in which, however, the Indians themselves (that is, the educated class to which Ocharik himself belonged!) ought to be increasingly integrated as imperial civil servants (pp.75-76). I have not been able to procure more information on Ocharik; he described himself as a “Calcutta Baboo, of its Burra Bazar” (p.6; for more on this, see Webster 2007 ), and A. Roy adds no further information to this. (Ocharik is cursorily mentioned in Roy, p.50)

<sup>4</sup> In 1828 Rammohan Roy wrote to Crawford in his capacity as the agent of the Calcutta merchants at the Parliament on the “Jury Bill” passed in the Bengal in 1826 and which introduced religious distinctions into the jurisprudence, and hence formally departed from the assumption of equality before the law. In the letter Roy requested Crawford’s support in presenting two petitions against this law for both chambers of the Parliament (*Collet & Sarkar*, p.1 & quotation on pp.53-54); alas I have not been able to locate any response from Crawford to Roy. For more on Roy’s work and writings within a liberal imperialist context, see Koditschek 2011, pp.90-97. For a recent assessment of Crawford’s role as a paid agent, see Chatterjee 2012, pp.144-145.

### 3. Apotheosis: Crawfurd as the Uncontested Malayan Authority

The publications of the “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language” (with its book length “Preliminary Dissertation”) in 1852 and the “Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries” in 1856 turned Crawfurd into the undisputed authority on all things Malay – on the Indian Archipelago, its people and languages.<sup>1</sup> Yet, this eulogy would hardly in itself qualify for a *discursive moment*, unless the key texts, and the publications that followed in their wake, contributed with new and fresh ways to approach these topics in question. Such texts should hence either represent an epochal shift or inaugurate new paradigms.

Viewed in isolation from their contemporary contexts, both the “Preliminary Dissertation” and the “Descriptive Dictionary” seemed before anything else to reflect a steady continuity; together they contained a theoretical synthesis and a radical rewriting of what Crawfurd earlier had written without adding much new to it – albeit they, as we will soon see, followed the trend in Crawfurd’s discourse of over time steadily ascribing a greater emphasis to the racial dimension in explaining the other phenomena. However, when situated within their contemporary contexts, another impression imposes itself; rather than representing an alternative approach to the Malay languages, and hence also to their ethnicity and history, Crawfurd finally seemed to have replaced Marsden as the metropolitan authority. Whether agreeing or dissenting with his interpretations, it was by now inevitable not to discuss these if addressing Malay topics. Once more the crucial questions regarding the function of language studies, the meaning of linguistic evidence, and the implications that could be inferred from these lurked beneath these debates that ostentatiously dealt with other, more pending issues; at times they even surfaced in the discourses as potent points of contestation.

By the 1850s these debates definitively had moved beyond a purely ‘intralinguistic’ sphere; the importance of language itself, both as an ethnic criterion and as an access to the past, was now challenged more than ever before. In this environment Crawfurd’s books were in some circles read in conjunction with the recently published texts by the Americans J.C. Nott and G.R. Gliddon, and in this context they were perceived as representative of a more rigidified racist paradigm which openly championed polygenism and the fixity of races. Yet this did not imply that philology had become irrelevant altogether, or that linguistic evidence was obsolete; the study of language

---

<sup>1</sup> As it was pointed in e.g. the reviews of the “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language” brought in the *Spectator* on Feb 28, 1852 (reprinted verbatim in *Littell’s Living Age*, Vol.XXXIII, Apr.-June 1852, pp.164-166); in *Perry*, p.254; in *Bunsen* 1854, p.412; and in *Burke*, p.373. A qualification of that view, however, was forwarded in the anonymous review of the “Descriptive Dictionary” brought in *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society* (Vol.II, 1857-1858, pp.142-144); here it was emphasised how many new authorities had appeared more recently, especially in the Netherlands, but also with the arrival of texts published by people like J.R. Logan and G.W. Earl in Singapore. Yet the reviewer still conceded that no one except Crawfurd had “ventured upon the labour of producing a systematic and comprehensive work on the subject, such as his ‘History of the Indian Archipelago’ and the volume before us.” The same was argued in the review brought in *JIA*. (New Ser. Vol.I, 1856, pp.291-295).

continued to be considered vital in the colonial setting, as both Erskine Perry's and J.R. Logan's discussions of Crawford's texts illustrated, as well as within the metropolitan science such as testified by F. Max Müller's critique of Crawford. By studying Crawford's writings and their receptions in the 1850s, I will, in the following, examine both the direct and more indirect ways in which Crawford's discourses on the Malayan and Polynesian languages, races, nations, and civilization contributed to some of the major themes of discussion in this transitory period before the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species" in 1859, the reinvigoration of the Ethnological Society and the formation of a rival Anthropological Society, and the vigorous debates and vitriolic climate that ensued from these during the 1860s.

### **3.1 Malayan Ethnology and Philology in 1840s: From Prichard to Crawford.**

Although I have not detected any discursive moment in 1840s involving Crawford, this does not imply that he was unproductive during these years. Crawford's article "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races", which I have frequently referred to in the preceding Parts, was originally read at the BAAS meeting in Oxford in 1847. It was subsequently printed in both the first volume of the Journal of the Ethnological Society, in the Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal,<sup>1</sup> and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> volume of the Singapore-based Journal of the Indian Archipelago (JIA). As such it must necessarily have reached a quite diverse public.<sup>2</sup>

In terms of both ethnology and of the philology interested in the more 'exotic' languages, the 1840s were in particular characterized by the establishment of an Ethnological Society of London in 1843, and by the publishing of J.C. Prichard's last work; these included the last volumes of five volume, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of his "Researches into the Physical History of Mankind" (1836-1847) as well as "The Natural History of Man" (1843).<sup>3</sup>

#### **3.1.1 Crawford and the Institutionalisation of Ethnological Studies in Britain.**

As an institution, the Ethnological Society grew out of the Aborigines Protection Society in an attempt to separate the philanthropic enterprise of saving savages in peril from a more 'detached'

---

<sup>1</sup> The Society's own journal was not published until 1848, 5 years after the establishment of the society itself, and even then its publication was rather sporadic (1<sup>st</sup> vol. in 1848, 2<sup>nd</sup> in 1850, 3<sup>rd</sup> in 1854, and 4<sup>th</sup> in 1856); hence many of the papers read the Society's meetings were (also) published in the Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal. (*Stocking 1971*, p.373, and *Stocking 1987*, pp.245-248)

<sup>2</sup> In Singapore it thus prompted the editor of JIA, J.R. Logan, to refer to a private correspondence he had had with Crawford on this topic the year before the article itself was published in this venue. (See *Logan 1848*, p.178)

<sup>3</sup> This was published again in an enlarged 2<sup>nd</sup> edition in 1845 and another even longer 3<sup>rd</sup> edition in 1848; later, after Prichard's demise, several even longer 2 volume editions were issued. For more on Prichard and his work, see *Stocking 1973*, *Augstein 1996*, *Augstein 1999*, and *Henze* for a more recent analysis of his discursive strategies.

and allegedly neutral interest in them as scientific objects of study.<sup>1</sup> The Ethnological Society, in other words, tried to emulate the French counterpart, the Société ethnologique de Paris, founded in 1839.<sup>2</sup> Yet the membership of this new society was still by and large recruited among the same constituency as that which made up the core of the APS, viz. especially Quaker and Evangelical Philanthropists such as Prichard and Hodgkin. As a result the new society remained committed to a monogenetic framework more or less explicitly grounded in the authority of Biblical Scripture, rather than imitating the unambiguously secularist tendencies evinced in the context of in its equivalent in Paris – with its focus on racial issues in a more biological sense, often combined with explicit polygenetic leanings.<sup>3</sup> This did not, however, detain its journal from at times including articles with a content that deviated fundamentally from this creed and scientific approach, such as the inclusion of Crawford’s article “On the Malayan and Polynesian Races and Languages” amply illustrated.

Despite these attempts at an institutional segregation between a body dedicated to political action on the one hand, and another one which managed the knowledge production, these two elements nonetheless continued to be closely aligned. Even though the main objective over time shifted from first saving the lives of the simple ‘savages’ from the apparently unstoppable juggernaut of British expansionism to then salvaging and documenting the last remnants of their culture, the ethical dimension did not disappear altogether.<sup>4</sup> In describing the plight of the primitive societies during their countless confrontations between the representatives of the ever advancing empire, the sympathy invariably lay with the former, notwithstanding whether the latter were in the shape of

---

<sup>1</sup> On the establishment of the APS and the subsequent formation of the Ethnological Society, as well as on their continued ideological, institutional, and personal intersections, see esp. *Stocking 1971*, pp.369-375 and *Stocking 1987*, pp.340-345; see also *Ellingson*, pp.222-242; *Brantlinger 2003*, esp. pp.86-90; and *Heartfield*, pp.23-41.

<sup>2</sup> On the establishment of this society, the scientific and intellectual contexts, as well as the inspiration drawn from the British APS and the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aborigines, see *Staum*, esp. pp.131-133.

<sup>3</sup> With its greater emphasis on physical anthropology and a greater liberation from the shackles of religious dogma, the French approaches to the study of man during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> C. appeared to embrace polygenism and an innate racial hierarchy more effortlessly than most of their British counterparts. (*Staum*, pp.19-21 & 136-141) Even though the Paris Ethnological Society, and the whole notion of ‘*ethnologie*’ in the French context, was influenced by A. Balbi’s philological approach to the study of ethnography (Balbi’s own term; see *Hodgkin 1827*, and *Staum*, p.135) and thus perhaps resembled the British context more than *the study of man* generally in France did, the founder of the Society, the avowed polygenist W.-F. Edwards, as well as most of its members “promoted notions of different centres of creation, if not outright polygenism.” And with this went “a tendency to make invidious comparisons in which certain peoples were deemed uncivilizable or civilizable only with European intervention.” (*Staum*, p.119-20, and also pp.131-157) For more on the French approach to the study of South Sea peoples, see *Douglas & Ballard*, pp.109-131.

<sup>4</sup> I here dissent fundamentally from T. Ellingson’s interpretation in which this “paradigm shift from ethically charged to avowedly neutral scientific representational foundations” paved the way, and indeed facilitated, the rise of a “new racist anthropology” in the 1850s. (*Ellingson*, pp.237-42; the quotation is from p.242) It is certain that die hard polygenist racialists, and indeed racists, such as R. Knox and J. Hunt availed themselves of this discursive opportunity and rhetorically presented themselves as the paladins of pure science; yet it is important, in the words of C. Kidd, not to misconstrue the rise of race science, such as Ellingson’s acutely presentist approach to my mind definitely is culpable of. As C. Kidd stressed: “The mainstream version of race science in the British world during the first half of the nineteenth century – as a body of enquiry whose aims were to reconcile the fact of the world’s racial diversity with a common humanity and to see off the polygenist heresy – was anti-racist in its motivations.” (*Kidd 2006*, p.135)

uncontrollable settlers along South African, Australian or Canadian fringes of the empire,<sup>1</sup> or they were in the form of an official body – such as the controversial part played by the Royal Navy in the chastisements of the Sea Dyaks along the coast of Borneo throughout the 1840s. Although focussing more on their acquired *civil rights* within the spatial and legal confines of the British empire and its moral *trusteeship*<sup>2</sup> than on a set of innate *human rights* of unquestionable universal validity, the focus continued to be on securing these rights as potential Christians and consumers of British goods, and hence also of preventing their extinction.<sup>3</sup>

Even though Crawford did not participate directly in the heavily politicised discussions that followed in the wake of Sir James Brooke's campaigns in collaboration with the Royal Navy along the northwest coast of Borneo, and which culminated in the controversial battle or massacre at Beting Maru on July 31, 1849,<sup>4</sup> he was by his contemporaries attributed with the authorship of an influential article on this topic in the *Examiner*, a weekly newspaper expounding a radical inclination, and in which he often published.<sup>5</sup> As an acknowledged metropolitan expert in this field Crawford seemed to be a perfect provider of information to the assailants of Brooke's politics, and he was the obvious intermediary between the two groups who criticised Brooke the most, viz. the Philanthropic faction organized in the APS<sup>6</sup> on the one hand, and his old friends and political allies – like the MPs Richard Cobden, Thomas Perronet Thompson, and Joseph Hume – on the other.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For examples hereof and an analysis of the accompanying discourses, see *Brantlinger 2003*, pp.68-93. He, however, was perfectly right in stressing that in the end it always represented "a variant of white supremacism that insisted on transforming savage customs and cultures into Christianity and white civilization." (p.93)

<sup>2</sup> *Stocking 1987*, p.242.

<sup>3</sup> As it has been interestingly argued in *Ellingson*, pp.221-232.

<sup>4</sup> This battle/massacre proved to be a turning point in Sir James Brooke's popularity at home in Britain. After this, criticism against his methods and ends moved from the discursive periphery in Britain to its political centre. In the end this critique resulted in establishment of a commission of inquiry seated in Singapore in 1854, and although it exonerated Brooke on most points, it also left an inedible stain on his prestige, compromising any future efforts at gaining official British support for the consolidation and expansion of his private rajahdom in Sarawak. The contemporary literature and subsequent historiography on this topic is vast, and in this context I will restrain myself to only refer to *Irwin 1955*, esp. pp.127-150; *Tarling 1963*, pp.112-145; *Ingleson*; *Tarling 1982*; *Walker*, esp. pp.70-98; and the recent article by *Middleton*.

<sup>5</sup> It was thus also in this newspaper that Crawford published his review of Darwin's "origin of Species" in 1859. The article in question here was published on Oct.21, 1848, and hence before the abovementioned clash at Beting Maru; it was entitled "Piracy in the Eastern Seas", and it first and foremost offered a reply to an article brought in the *Edinburgh Review* in Jul the same year ("Piracy in the Oriental Archipelago", 88:177, pp.63-94). The article in the *Examiner* chided the *Edinburgh Review* article for exaggerating the extent of piracy in the Indian Archipelago which thus favoured Brooke and his allies. That Crawford was the author of this article was intimated in e.g. an article in *The Mirror Monthly Magazine* (Vol.IV, Dec. 1848, pp.561-571), entitled "The 'Edinburgh Review' and the 'Examiner'". The article in the *Examiner*, anonymously authored by Crawford, was criticised severely the year after by Spenser St. John – brother to Horace St. John and Brooke's private secretary – in an article in *JIA* on "Piracy in the Indian Archipelago", as being "erroneous in point of fact, calculated greatly to misled the public, and above all to obstruct the vigorous measures carrying on for the suppression of the marauders who infest the Eastern Seas" (*St. John 1849*, p.251; for allusions to Crawford as being the author of the article in the *Examiner*, see the same page)

<sup>6</sup> Such as its secretary L.A. Chamerovzow; see *Chamerovzow*.

<sup>7</sup> For examples hereof, see *Chamerovzow*, *Foggo*, *Hume*, *Scrutator*, *WN*; see also *Middleton*, p.391.

### 3.1.2 Crawford and J.C. Prichard's Malayo-Polynesian Language and Race.

J.C. Prichard was right up to his death in 1848 the uncontested leader of British ethnology and the foremost exponent of a philologically focused, monogenist interpretation of the origin and history of mankind. Yet, unlike more philanthropic inclined advocates like T. Hodgkin, Prichard was more committed to the ethnology as a science, than to the political dimension of philanthropy.<sup>1</sup> Despite abiding by his strictly monogenist framework, Prichard's approaches and views changed markedly over time, though. As stressed by G.W. Stocking, Prichard's central concern "was not development but derivation, not progress but origin", and from this followed a "fundamentally diffusionist rather than developmentalist" ethnology; and consequently, in this quest, "the physical anthropological approach to race was systematically subordinated to approaches in cultural and especially linguistic terms."<sup>2</sup>

Yet this did not preclude certain shifts in terms of the meaning ascribed to- and the explanative power vested in these concepts within Prichard's discourses over the course of his career, and by the time of the publication of the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of the "Researches into the Physical History of Mankind" and "The Natural History of Man" Prichard's approach had become increasingly more attentive of racial matters. B. Douglas has thus remarked how Prichard in the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of the "Researches" "reinscribed without comment the scurrilous racial terminology and discriminations of his (often French) sources and in the process essentialized the characters of certain races in very negative terms".<sup>3</sup> This also influenced his analytical approach to the peoples of the Oceanic region. Instead of considering them as pertaining to one large *stock*, Prichard now claimed that they were divided into three remarkably different *principal groups*. Although he adroitly avoided the implementation of a rigid and systematic racial taxonomy his discourse was nonetheless permeated with a terminology that connoted a clear racialized hierarchy of civilization vs. savagery formulated on biological criteria; this, again, intimated a historical dynamics structured along the same lines as the displacement narrative which we have met so often before, and where the black races were gradually displaced, outbred, or exterminated by the advancing lighter-skinned, more advanced races.<sup>4</sup> However, when it came to the question of the composition of the linguistically defined group of yellow- Or brown-complexioned peoples stretching from Madagascar to Easter Island, Prichard followed Marsden closely, and he stressed their basic unity as comprising a particular and coherent "race or family of nations".<sup>5</sup> Yet, unlike Marsden, this connection was no longer solely conceived

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Stocking 1987, pp.242-244; and Ellingson, pp.240-241.

<sup>2</sup> Both quotes are from Stocking 1987, pp.51-52.

<sup>3</sup> Douglas & Ballard, p.42.

<sup>4</sup> For an analysis of this, see Douglas & Ballard, pp.131-133.

<sup>5</sup> This phrase was used in both Prichard 1843, p.36 (The part on the "Pelagian Races", pp.325-345, was repeated verbatim in the enlarged 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> editions published in 1843 and 1848), and in Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.4.

as a philological unit, but instead it was couched in unmistakeable *racial terms* – albeit it was still principally inferred and delineated by linguistic evidence. But even if this unit continued to be positively defined on linguistic grounds, Prichard nonetheless demarcated it negatively from the other two *principal groups* in this huge insular region of *Oceanica*,<sup>1</sup> the *Pelagian Negroes* and the *Alfoers*, on purely physical criteria.<sup>2</sup> Only the first of these principal groupings, i.e. the yellow or brown-complexioned peoples, could be considered a race in a more strict meaning of the term;<sup>3</sup> that is, as a “family of nations” since only here “a real kindred, or community of origin had been proved, by affinity of language, to exist among them.”<sup>4</sup>

It was this huge philologically defined and biologically demarcated race that Prichard, as apparently the first in the English-spoken realm, denominated *Malayo-Polynesian*. The term was, as analysed in Part II, most probably borrowed from F. Bopp’s term “malayisch-polynesischen Sprachen”,<sup>5</sup> whereas his general approach closely mirrored W. von Humboldt’s, whom he also mentioned as his greatest source of inspiration.<sup>6</sup> In contrast to Marsden’s silence on the physiological differences between the nations and tribes belonging to this linguistically linked group, or race, Prichard openly addressed this issue. As a result of the new surge of information contained in the many publications that followed in the wake of both the intensified missionary activity and the renewal of the scientific expeditions to these regions, the seemingly glaring differences in physiognomy between the inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago and those in the Pacific who allegedly spoke kindred languages could not be ignored. Prichard conceded that “in adverting to the question, what place in the ethnological systems belongs to the Malayo-Polynesian race, we are led to the statement of a fact which many persons will not be disposed to admit, *the entire group of these nations, though, strictly speaking, one race, do not display the same physical*

<sup>1</sup> A term which Prichard claimed to have borrowed directly from Malte-Brun (*Prichard 1843*, p.326 and *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, p.1) without any references to Crawford’s article from 1834.

<sup>2</sup> The *Pelagian Negroes*, sometimes called Papuas, were described as woolly-haired peoples, “resembling in their features and colour the Negroes of Guinea”, and inhabited interior and remote parts of the Indian Archipelago as well as New Guinea and the surrounding isles (See *Prichard 1843*, pp.346-351). The *Alfoers*, or Alaforas, were supposed to inhabit the interior of New Guinea as well as constituting the Australian Aborigines; as such they differed markedly from the 3<sup>rd</sup> race, the existence of which was intimated by Crawford in 1834; furthermore he discussed the possibility whether, for instance, the interior of Borneo was peopled by such Alaforas. (See *Prichard 1843*, pp.351-355). In 1847 Prichard operated with a slightly different category: here he classified the “black nations of Oceanica”, or “Kelæonesia”, into “the puny negroes of the Indian seas” (that is, Negritos), Papuas, etc. and distinguished these markedly from the “natives of Australasia” – by which he referred to Australia (the first groups were dealt with in *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, book v, ch.viii (pp.212-257), and the latter in ch.ix (pp.258-279)). For more on the many changes and manifold uses of the terms ‘Papua’ and ‘Alafora’/‘Alfuros’, see Gelpke and Moore.

<sup>3</sup> Which was not consistently used within Prichard’s discourse; for instance, he thus shortly after this remark spoke of “Polynesian races” (*Prichard 1843*, p.329) (On Prichard’s use of the term and concept of *race* in the classification of mankind, see Augstein 1996, pp.307-326).

<sup>4</sup> *Prichard 1843*, p.326. He continued by emphasising that “the two others [principal groupings] probably constitute as many races, since we seem able to trace them from one cluster to another; but certainty is yet wanting on this point.”

<sup>5</sup> As it also appeared in the title of Bopp 1841.

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. *Prichard 1843*, p.327 and in particular *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, pp.14-15. For more on Prichard’s use of Humboldt and other German philological, see Augstein 1996, pp.383-393.



type. Many late voyagers, indeed, have been struck by the great difference, in this respect, which exists between the natives of the Indian Archipelago, of the *Malayan stock*, and the remote *Polynesian races*; and on this ground they have pronounced them to be of distinct origin.”<sup>1</sup> Prichard, however, did not acquiesce to this conclusion; instead he took recourse in an explanation firmly grounded in climate and environmental factors.

“Great as the physical difference is between these nations, it will be found by those who give due weight to the evidence offered by late researches in their history, that *there is full and complete proof of the unity of descent in the whole class*, and that there is no probable way of explaining the diversities that exist between them, *unless we attribute these diversities to the spontaneous variations which display themselves in tribes of people who have inhabited from immemorial ages different climates, and have existed, in many respects, under different physical conditions.*”<sup>2</sup>

Within this general framework Prichard then seemed to follow the standard narrative delineated by Marsden, and in his long discourse from 1847 he located “the ancient abode of the Malayo-Polynesian tribes, or the primitive home of the race,” to some, yet unidentified, “islands of the Indian Ocean”, as “far as historical traditions and inquiries afford us information”.<sup>3</sup> All the societies composed of these dispersed people, inhabiting the vast area of the Indian Archipelago and the coastal fringes of the Malayan peninsula, were thus deemed to be “Malays in the strictest [i.e. *biologically racial*] sense of the term; they are people of *one dialect, and nearly of the same manners and cultivation*”, although they differed “in *degrees of civilization.*”<sup>4</sup> This was, once again, an invocation of Blumenbach’s idea of an autochthonous Malayan race that, nonetheless, remained firmly embedded in a monogenetic global narrative. With regard to the origin and history of the Malayan *nation*, or the history of “the Malayan age” as he labelled it,<sup>5</sup> Prichard again followed the basics in Marsden’s approach and identified Menangkabau as the original site for the nation which later came to be the “Mohammedan colonists of the Malayan race” who from Malacca “spread their [Malayan] language and manners” all over the Indian Archipelago. Apart from Marsden, Prichard also referred to João de Barros’s account at times, quoted often from Raffles’ HJ and Crawford’s HIA, as well as he seemed to continue the predilection towards Leyden’s interpretation of these events that he already demonstrated in the 1<sup>st</sup> edition of the “Researches” in 1813.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Prichard 1843, p.329; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Prichard 1843, p.329; my italics. The reference to “late researches into their history” most probably pointed to the work done by W. von Humboldt.

<sup>3</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.6.

<sup>4</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.6.; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.35.

<sup>6</sup> Although taking his point of departure in Marsden’s interpretation, as well as abiding by a strict genealogical framework, Prichard assessed that for most of the information we possess on this subject [the Malays] we are indebted

More interesting, perhaps, was Prichard's ideas on the modality of the linkage between Madagascar and the rest of the Malayo-Polynesian race. He was quite unequivocal in establishing an essential connection between these, and he identified these as composing the third *branch* of the *Malayan stock*, or *Indo-Polynesian race*.

In arguing this stance Prichard in 1843 closely followed W. von Humboldt's interpretation and quoted many the same sources as he did.<sup>1</sup> This interpretation was contrasted with the one offered by Adelung and Vater, and discussed earlier by Malte-Brun, and from which Prichard quoted extensively in this subchapter;<sup>2</sup> Adelung and Vater had concluded that the linguistic connection between Malayan and Malagasy "was not original, and that each idiom had a distinct basis." Yet, Prichard claimed that "this opinion has been entirely refuted by Humboldt, who has set the question for ever at rest, and has demonstrated the Madecassian [Malagasy] to be a genuine and real offspring of the great Malayo-Polynesian language." Thence, Prichard concluded, "*the mass of the population in this island must be considered as of Malayan descent*", even though the part of the archipelago from whence they arrived could not be ascertained.<sup>3</sup> In discussing their physical features, Prichard focussed in particular on the "Ovahs" [Hovas], the dominant tribe inhabiting the central plateau of the island and who were considered the most civilized. Although Prichard conceded that it did "not appear that they have all the peculiarities of the genuine Malays", it seemed more important, nonetheless that "neither is there, in general, any thing indicative of an approach to the Negro character",<sup>4</sup> and hence there existed absolutely evidence pointing to an African origin. In the absence of such biological evidence, philology spoke clearly in favour of the Malayo-Polynesian connection.

By 1847 it was, however, Crawford who had substituted Adelung and Vater as Humboldt's rhetorical opponent in Prichard's discourse, and the matrix of evidence adduced from the different disciplines of knowledge appeared by now to have become somewhat more complex. Referring to the argument advanced by Crawford in HIA, Prichard focussed on Crawford's assessment that the parts of Malayan encountered in the Malagasy language were "not part of the fundamental and original speech", before siding with W. von Humboldt in claiming that the very reverse of this opinion as "demonstrably true"; the linguistic connections were on the contrary of an essential

---

to the late learned and indefatigable Dr. Leyden (*Prichard 1813*, p.300), and he also appropriated Leyden's analysis of the Malay language. (p.304)

<sup>1</sup> See *Prichard 1843*, p.341-345.

<sup>2</sup> Although Prichard's references here were not taken from Malte-Brun's *Geography* but from the narrative of M.J.B. Fressange's voyage to Madagascar, and which was published in Malte-Brun's compilation "*Annales de Voyages*" (*Prichard 1843*, p.343; "*Annales de Voyages*" was published in the years 1808-1814 and again from 1819 and onwards as "*Nouvelle Annales de Voyages*", *Bredal*, p.356)

<sup>3</sup> All quoted are from *Prichard 1843*, p.342; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> *Prichard 1843*, p.345.

nature and reflected its grammar and fundamental structure.<sup>1</sup> This implied with certainty “that a tribe of people akin to the Malays must have settled in Madagascar, and brought with them a language which *entirely superseded and extinguished any pre-existing dialect that may have been spoken in the island.*”<sup>2</sup> It was especially in the case of the Hova nation evident that they were the descendants of “a colony from some part of the Indian Archipelago” who had brought with them the practices of- and the terms indicating such civilization enhancing aspects as the cultivation of the land.<sup>3</sup> However, this approach opened the possibility, explicitly rejected in 1843, of the island being populated by “distinct nations derived from different original stems, though now united by conquest.”<sup>4</sup> As opposed to the Malay-like, civilized Hovas Prichard placed the Sakalavas, “the black natives of Madagascar” who were “physically considered the finest race in Madagascar.”<sup>5</sup> These obvious differences in appearance prompted Prichard to mention how “it is commonly supposed that the people of Madagascar *consist of different races, some tribes being of African origin, while others are descended from the Malayo-Polynesian stock.*”<sup>6</sup> All of this, however, remained garmented in doubt-generating rhetoric which hinted rather than claimed. Prichard continued: “this opinion rests on no historical evidence, for there is no historical testimony, not even that of oral tradition, that reaches back to a remote period in this island. Nor has any confirmation of the same notion been obtained from a comparison of the Malecassian dialects with the idioms of the tribes in Africa. The assertion has been made on mere conjecture from the resemblance of physical characters”. Despite his proclivity towards evidence adduced from language rather than from biology, it had to “be admitted that this conjecture is a very probable one.”<sup>7</sup>

In sum, it could not be denied that behind it all strong connotations of the familiar displacement narrative seemed to lurk. Yet this idea was never fully articulated, and the discursive surface, as if guided by an almost exorcist insistence, remained ruled by a univocal emphasis on a racial unity despite the obvious differences in physiognomy: both his general ethnological doctrine and the absolute primacy accorded to philological evidence facilitated such an interpretation!

It was not merely on the Madagascar question that Prichard in 1847 contrasted Humboldt’s interpretation with Crawford’s regarding what could be inferred from philological evidence, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.53.

<sup>2</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, pp.53-54.

<sup>3</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.209.

<sup>4</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.199.

<sup>5</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, pp.202-203. As typical of the lack of terminological consistency, Prichard mentioned “the Sakalava race”, for in the next sentence to state that “the Sakalavas are divided into two races”.

<sup>6</sup> Prichard 1847, vol.V, pp.191-192; my italics.

<sup>7</sup> Both quotes are from Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.192.

where he perceived these as constituting two fundamentally discrepant approaches. He had also done so in a larger context encompassing the whole region populated by the Malayo-Polynesian race. After having enumerated the main points contained in Crawfurd's argument, Prichard first raised severe doubts about it on extra-linguistic grounds before refuting it on intra-linguistic evidence. If Crawfurd's hypothesis of the dual dissemination of a great Polynesian civilization and language was right, then this seemed to imply that the entire Polynesian race, inhabiting the islands of the Pacific,<sup>1</sup> would have had to unlearn the use of metal, certain agricultural and mechanical arts, as well as many improvements in social life; this would, again, entail a uniform retrograde process of civilization in the entire region of Polynesia, or eastern Oceanica, something which Prichard thought highly improbable.<sup>2</sup> In the intra-linguistic context, Prichard first adduced evidence interpreted within the framework of Marsden's word list, which he, however, ascribed to "the point of view in which M. Abel Rémusat has taught us to compare idioms of different nations".<sup>3</sup> Only then did he turn to W. von Humboldt in order to provide the final evidence. "If to all these proofs we add the undoubted unity in grammatical structure and in the first principles of the formation of words which M. de Humboldt has most fully demonstrated to exist, there seems to be scarcely any room left for doubt as to the conclusion we most adopt."<sup>4</sup> Hence Prichard concluded that "it is an unquestionable fact that all these dialects [pertaining to his class of Malayo-Polynesian languages] belong to one original stem, the unity of which is not less demonstrable than that of the different members of the Indo-European family of languages."<sup>5</sup>

### 3.1.3 Contextualizing "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races"

It is within this context that Crawfurd's article published in the JES in 1848 has to be assessed. Not only did it represent an elaboration of the argument launched by Crawfurd in 1834, and which here became bolstered with some new evidence that had appeared in the meantime, but it also had a more polemical dimension, and as such intended to provide an answer to opponents like Prichard.

Originally it was delivered as a paper in the section on ethnography at the yearly meeting at the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS), held at Oxford in 1847. As well

---

<sup>1</sup> Prichard's use of the term *Polynesia* was thus strictly confined to a certain part of the Pacific (or 'eastern Oceanica'), demarcated from both the Indian Archipelago, the black natives of the region, and Micronesia – hence it by and large resembled the spatial and ethnographical content implied in our present use of the term.

<sup>2</sup> *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, pp.12-13. Instead of such a process of degeneration Prichard thought that "those portions both of the languages and of the population of different islands, which may be termed Polynesian...., are the most ancient and original [of the whole Oceanic region]." (p.13)

<sup>3</sup> *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, p.13. J.-P. Abel-Rémusat (1788-1832) was first and foremost renowned as a prominent French sinologist who also functioned as the editor of the *Journal Asiatique*; he is, however, perhaps even better known for his published correspondence with W. von Humboldt on in particular the nature and potential of the mono-syllabic Chinese language. (see e.g. *Aarsleff 1988*; *Hillemann*, pp.154-158; and in particular *Joseph*, which deals with at length with this relationship).

<sup>4</sup> *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, p.14.

<sup>5</sup> *Prichard 1847*, vol.V, p.15.

Prichard, Latham, Max Müller, and Bunsen presented papers at this meeting,<sup>1</sup> and although the Report from the meeting does not contain any references to how Crawford's paper was received, it seems highly unlikely that it was passed by unnoticed in this company. The original title of Crawford's paper appears merely to have been "On the Malay Languages".<sup>2</sup> This was obviously a much less controversial title than the later one, viz. that of "On the Malayan *and* Polynesian Languages *and* Races". When inscribed into a context composed of Prichard's recent writings, as well as being originally read in the presence of this doyen of English ethnology and his foremost ethnological and philological scions, then the two conjunctions in the latter title – indicated by the two seemingly innocuous instances of an '*and*' – suddenly acquire a new, more cogent meaning. Instead of being merely descriptive, they seemed to represent a deliberately polemical accentuation of Crawford's oppositional approach and interpretation, even though Prichard's name was glaringly absent in the article – actually Prichard would not become the main rhetorical opponent in Crawford's discourse until the 1860s. Instead Marsden continued to stand as the main representative of the methodological approach and interpretation which Crawford refuted; on par with Marsden's, W. von Humboldt's analysis was also politely, yet decisively, rejected within this discourse.<sup>3</sup>

Crawford reiterated the same ideas as in the article from 1834, but by now the insistence on separating language and race as two, in theory, unconnected issues had become even more enounced; furthermore, he stressed the multiple, independent origins of languages and races in the region even further. That is, an insistence on the idea of both linguistic and racial polygenism.<sup>4</sup> Only later had a civilizational and linguistic dissemination, emanating indirectly from Java through the direct migrations of the Malay people, tied the entire region as an ethnological entity through its shared linguistic features.<sup>5</sup> We have already seen in Part I, chapter 3 how the number of races of Eastern Negroes mushroomed in Crawford's discourse over the years,<sup>6</sup> but as the title indicated Crawford also distinguished a Malayan race from an essentially different Polynesian race. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Apart from presenting several papers on specific philological and ethnological topics, they all had longer papers printed in the Report. For an analysis of these early meetings, see *Withers, Finnegan, & Higgitt* and *Withers 2011*.

<sup>2</sup> Mentioned on p.119 in the section on "Notices and Abstracts of Communications to the British Association for the Advancement of Science at the Oxford Meeting, June 1847", in *Report of the Seventeenth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; Held at Oxford in June 1847*.

<sup>3</sup> Only two references to W. von Humboldt occurred in this article, and both contained rejections of his general interpretation. (*Crawford 1848a*, pp.330 & 347)

<sup>4</sup> "As far, then, as physical form is concerned, it is certain enough that none of these widely scattered races could have sprung from one and the same stock, as has been imagined; yet, in most of the many tongues spoke by them, whether brown or Negro, traces of a Malayan language are to be found." (*Crawford 1848a*, pp.337-338) According to Crawford, this shared portion a language did obviously not imply a shared origin of language, but merely a subsequent dissemination of Malay language and civilization. On the contrary, "A brief examination, phonetical, grammatical, and verbal or glossarial, of some of the principal languages, will, I think, *clearly shew that they are generally distinct tongues, not derived from a common stock.*" (p.338; my italics)

<sup>5</sup> As it was concluded on *Crawford 1848a*, p.374.

<sup>6</sup> By 1848 it had reached 8 different races of the 'oriental negro', excluding the inhabitants on Madagascar and in Australia! (*Crawford 1848a*, p.337)

racial difference was argued primarily on evidence derived from physiology, but it was allegedly supported by evidence adduced from language. After describing the physical features of the inhabitants inhabiting the Pacific, from Tonga to Easter Island, Crawford concluded that: “in so far then, as physical form is concerned, there can, I think, be little doubt that this race, so tall and well-proportioned, is a very distinct one from the short and squat Malay, from which it has been gratuitously imagined to be derived.”<sup>1</sup> In terms of language Crawford concurred with the general consensus in assessing that all the languages spoken on these Pacific isles were “essentially the same”. Yet, as it has been discussed in the preceding Part, Crawford denied the existence of an *essential connection* between this Polynesian language and the languages spoken in the Indian Archipelago; instead he opted for a mere accidental linkage.<sup>2</sup>

All these themes turned the Madagascar question into a topic of particular interest. Accordingly this topic occupied a much more prominent place within Crawford’s discourse than ever before. In terms of biology, Crawford left little doubt about what he thought to be the racial origin of *all* the inhabitants on the island:

“The inhabitants of Madagascar, very wantonly imagined by some writers to be of the Malayan race, simply because in the Malagasi language there have been found a few words of a Malayan tongue. But the people of Madagascar, whether Hovas or ordinary Malagasis, *are merely a variety of the African negro*, and, neither in colour, features, form, or stature, do they bear any analogy either to the Malayan race, or to any section of the oriental negro.”<sup>3</sup>

The presence of some “words of a Malayan tongue”, however few they might have been, evidently pointed to some kind of connection, but in itself it did not tell anything about the nature and profundity of this connection; this all depended on the interpretation of the linguistic data and the framework in which it became embedded. However, what by now could be inferred from language counted little in comparison with what could be decoded from racial evidence:

“The whole number of Malayan words in the Malagasi does not exceed one fifty-seventh part of the language, and they are, as I have shewn, not essential to it. There is, in short, [1]

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.333. Although Crawford did not use the term ‘Polynesian’ here, it was evident from his geographical demarcations that he operated with the same notion of Polynesian as the one developed by the French explorers and geographers during the 1820s and 1830s, and which Prichard also seemed to employ in his hyphenated Malayo-Polynesian race. Furthermore, Crawford referred to a “third subdivision of the brown-complexioned and lank-haired people” (pp.331-332) corresponding exactly with the Micronesian race as defined by Dumont d’Urville and popularized by D. de Rienzi in 1836 (see *Tcherkézoff*, pp.179-181)

<sup>2</sup> “The Malayan words which have their way into the Polynesian, are far too few and unimportant to form an essential portion of the language, the grammatical structure of which is complete without reference to them.” (Crawford 1848a, p.351)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.337; my italics.

*nothing in common between the two races, and [2] nothing in common between the character of the languages.”*<sup>1</sup>

The slight and superficial contact between Madagascar and the homeland of the Malay language and race was, as already mentioned, explained in terms of “the fortuitous arrival on the shores of Madagascar of tempest-driven Malay praus.”<sup>2</sup> Although “the occasional arrival in Madagascar of a ship-wrecked prau, *might not, indeed, be sufficient to account* for even the small portion of Malay found in Malagasi”, Crawford nevertheless maintained this explanatory mode, and emphasised that “it is offering no violence to the manners or history of the Malay people, to imagine the probability of a piratical fleet, of which there are examples on record, being tempest-driven, like a single prau. ... It may seem, then, not an improbable supposition, that it was through one or more fortuitous adventures of this description, that the language of Madagascar received its influx of Malay.”<sup>3</sup> This argumentation rested upon a geographical premise according to which the communication between the two locations was manifestly unidirectional. “A voyage from the Indian Islands to Madagascar is possible; but return would be wholly impossible. *Commerce, conquests, or colonization are, consequently, utterly out of the question as means of conveying any portion of the Malay language to Madagascar.*”<sup>4</sup> This haphazard and purely accidental kind of contact facilitated a narrative in which the Malay element merely consisted in the presence of a contingent vocabulary indicating the introduction of some *civilizational progress*,<sup>5</sup> without, however, leaving any particular *cultural traces*, and where the *racial component* had been absolutely absorbed in the interval that had passed since the accidental arrival of such a fleet.<sup>6</sup>

### 3.1.4 Concluding Reflections.

The attention paid to the racial aspect during the 1840s appeared to be much more extensive than in the earlier decades. Rather than arising from any abrupt break, this change seemed to be the result of a gradual process which, however, did not turn into an object of explicit discussion in these

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.366; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.366.

<sup>3</sup> Both of these quotes are from Crawford 1848a, p.367.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1848a, p.366; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford did not dwell on this topic in this article, but it did constitute an element of continuity in his discourse on Madagascar throughout the entire period of his textual production. (For earlier references to this, see HIA, Vol.I, p.29; and Crawford 1834a, pp.404-405)

<sup>6</sup> Regarding the dating of this contact, Crawford repeated the argument already made back in 1820, and stated that, on account of an absence of Sanskrit words, the contact must most probably have taken place either before or “as early as the epoch of the connection of the Hindoos with the Indian Archipelago – a connection, the commencement of which cannot, I think, be placed later than the birth of Christ.” (Crawford 1848a, pp.367-368. See also HIA, Vol.I, p.29) The more exact dating, to around the time of the birth of Christ, was new in Crawford’s discourse though, and it closely resembled (both in the dating as well as in the rationale and the actual wording!) what Prichard had written on that topic the year before. “The existence of a Malayo-Polynesian tribe in Madagascar may therefore be dated from times antecedent to the Christian era.” (Prichard 1847, vol.V, p.210) The crucial contrast, however, was the “existence of a Malayo-Polynesian *tribe* in Madagascar” in Prichard’s discourse, whereas Crawford only saw the presence of a few civilization-indicating words, caused by the arrival of a few adventurers.

discourses on Southeast Asia and its inhabitants before the 1830s. The 1840s saw a further intensification of this trend, but it was not until the two following decades that the concept of race rose to the epistemological prominence and ideological notoriety for which it is justly infamous today. Yet this process towards prominence was neither uniform in its conceptual and applicative scope nor was it uncontested in its own day; on the contrary, despite a retrospectively detected trend of a racialization of the discourse, this process nonetheless evolved along convoluted, inconsistent, and ever changing trajectories, and the dynamics of the discursive formations in which Crawford's texts were embedded provide an emblematic example hereof. From the 1840s and onward it could even be argued that Crawford actually composed a part of the vanguard who set the standards about what topics that were considered relevant to discuss and on how these should be conceptualized, rather than merely reviewing and commenting upon what others had already written. Thus, from now on, Crawford's discourses did not only illustrate but also abetted the conceptualization and implementation of this increasing racialization.

A succinct example of the how the racial concept gradually became rigidified and its explanative power grew within Crawford's discourse can be gleaned from a complete reversal in the use of the analogies between the Malay and the Norse seaborne civilizations. Whereas Crawford in 1814, as we have seen earlier in this Part, had stated that the Malay civilization bears "a striking resemblance to that of the Nations of the North of Europe when similarly situated", and how "in the most distant & dissimilar climates the manners of mankind under similar circumstances assume nearly the same character & appearance",<sup>1</sup> he some 30 years later refuted the very ground upon which this comparison was made. In the article on "Piracy in the Eastern Archipelago" published in the Examiner in 1848 he most decidedly declined this:

"most whimsical comparison, meant for a parallel, between 'the Northern Sea Kings and the Malay Buccaneers;' that is, *between men of opposite and distinct races, inhabiting opposite climates, – between giants and pigmies, – between the men who overcame the waves and tempests of the German Ocean, and men who always sail with a fair wind in a region that knows no storms, – between the men who conquered Britain, and these who plundered fishermen and small crafts.*"<sup>2</sup>

Despite the influence of an overt political agenda upon the rhetoric in this article, it nevertheless leaves us with unambiguous impression of the epistemic triumph of race over both climate and stadial civilization. Although Crawford continued to accord climate an influential role in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Mss Eur Mack Private 85/1, p.31.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1848c.



formations and progress of civilization,<sup>1</sup> it was, however, race that now determined both the final outcome of this process and the analytical scope of the chosen framework of comparison.

### **3.2 The Receptions of the “Grammar and Dictionary” and the “Descriptive Dictionary”.**

Although the German Orientalist journal, “*Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*”, in 1849 had commended Crawford’s article “On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races” as a “very thorough ethnographical work” which in particular contained interesting comments on the languages,<sup>2</sup> Crawford’s ethnological discourse remained rather marginal to the approaches and the interpretations expressed through the prevailing Prichardian paradigm.

Yet by 1852 Prichard had been dead for three years, and although his ‘successor’ as the figurehead of the English philologically-orientated ethnology, R.G. Latham (1812-1888),<sup>3</sup> had also written on Southeast Asian topics,<sup>4</sup> Crawford by now stood out as *the* metropolitan British expert in this field. In Singapore, J.R. Logan had begun to launch a series of articles on what might under one common head be denominated “the languages and ethnology of the Indo-Pacific islanders” in his own journal. Yet the biggest challenge to Crawford’s prominent position still seemed to stem from the continent, from whence it still came in the shape of W. von Humboldt’s perhaps dated text but definitely not outdated theory and hypotheses.

In his “Preliminary Dissertation” and “Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries”, Crawford in all essentials repeated the hypotheses from 1848 on the original abode of the Malays, as well as regarding the racial and linguistic compositions of the societies of Madagascar. Although the argumentation would now be replenished with much more evidence than in the article, both the result and the rationale would remain unaltered.

The Malay *race* was autochthonous to the region, and whatever that could be entitled to carry the label of civilization had originated with these people.<sup>5</sup> With regard to the “question of the parent country of a people so widely spread over the Archipelago” as the Malay *race* was, Crawford merely stated that it “has been much debated, but certainly not settled, nor, indeed, likely ever to be

---

<sup>1</sup> As it was especially the case in *Crawford 1861a*, *Crawford 1861d*, and *Crawford 1863a*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Spiegel*, p.471.

<sup>3</sup> On Latham and his philological studies and ethnological work, see *Stocking 1987*, e.g. pp.53, 58, 97 & 103-104; *Trautmann 1997/2004*, pp.179-180; and S. Qureshi’s recent article on Latham’s racial ideas in the 1850s. (*Qureshi*)

<sup>4</sup> See *Latham 1843*; see also *Aarsleff 1966/1983*, esp. pp.221-222 on the establishment of- and early work in the Philological Society. Aarsleff’s main argument was that this venue did *not* create a forum for the “new philology”, inaugurated by Sir W. Jones. In terms of investigative fields the venue provided by this society emphasised “three kinds of work: classical philology; the investigation of the forms, dialects, and etymologies of English; and the ethnologically oriented philology that turned to distant non-Indo-European languages”, such as in Latham’s work referred to above.

<sup>5</sup> *Crawford 1856*, p.259. (Under the entry on ‘Man’)

precisely determined.” Indeed, it was asserted, “nothing better than a reasonable hypothesis can be offered.”<sup>1</sup> Then he moved on to discuss “the first seat of the Malay *nation*”, as an ethnic entity and/or a political unit, which he located to either the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, or the islands lying in between.<sup>2</sup> Distinguishing explicitly between *nation* and *civilization*, Crawfurd then noted that: “the origin of the Malay *civilisation*, however, is quite a distinct matter from that of the *nation*; and we may be tolerably sure that this did not spring up in the Peninsula, or islands adjacent to it, for no civilisation has ever sprung up in any part of the globe in a country of such a physical character.”<sup>3</sup> After refuting these two possibilities, Crawfurd moved on to conclude that there is but one country eminently favourable to the development of an early civilisation, in which we find the Malay *nation* planted – Menangkabo, so often referred to in Malay story.”<sup>4</sup> The entire argumentation in favour of this hypothesis was purely based on geographical criteria;<sup>5</sup> the Sumatran tablelands offered the only location in possession of the elements necessary for a civilization of that magnitude to originate and subsequently prosper, before it, through migrations, disseminated to the coastal parts of most of the Indian Archipelago, and even spread some of its elements beyond that space to Polynesia and Madagascar. In his analysis of the civilization(s) in the region, Crawfurd claimed to have applied a universalistic approach, and the “causes which have contributed to the advancement or retardment of civilisation in the Indian islands have been mainly the same as in other parts of the world.” Hence, in endeavouring to explain why the Javanese civilization (and the Malay too, for that matter) had not evolved to the same heights as, for instance, the Egyptian, the Assyrian, the Indian, or the Chinese civilizations, Crawfurd took recourse to what he perceived to be an arresting racial element; accounting for this discrepancy, Crawfurd concluded that “the solution will probably be found in *the inferior intellectual capacity of the races occupying the Malayan Archipelago*, for it is difficult to find any other.”<sup>6</sup> This unequivocally racial explanation of civilizational phenomena clearly anticipated Crawfurd’s later discourses on these topics,<sup>7</sup> and it heralded a new and much more uncompromising attitude towards the civilizational potential of most the races.

By now Crawfurd had changed his mind and claimed that Madagascar actually was inhabited by two different “classes” who exhibited clear racial differences; however, both of these were still considered to be of African descent.<sup>8</sup> They had, admittedly, made considerable advances in

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawfurd 1856, pp.250-251. (Under the entry on ‘Malay’)

<sup>2</sup> Crawfurd 1856, p.251.

<sup>3</sup> Crawfurd 1856, p.251; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Crawfurd 1856, p.252; my italics.

<sup>5</sup> In this context Crawfurd thus explicitly denied that any historical value should be attributed to the Malays’ own historiography or mythology. (Crawfurd 1856, pp.250 & 251)

<sup>6</sup> Crawfurd 1856, p.264; my italics. (Under the entry on ‘Man’)

<sup>7</sup> As it would be shortly after be elaborated in *Crawfurd 1861a*, and *Crawfurd 1861d*; these were originally delivered in 1858 and 1859 respectively.

<sup>8</sup> *Crawfurd 1852*, Vol.I, p.cxlvi.

civilization, when judged after an African standard,<sup>1</sup> and, just like the by now much aggrandized amount of linguistic evidence, this pointed to a Malayan connection with Madagascar of the kind described in his earlier articles from 1834 and 1848.<sup>2</sup> Four years later he would further elaborate on this: “In civilisation, the [Malay] adventurers would be superior to the [Malagasi] natives; their numbers would be too few for conquest, but their power, from superior civilisation, might be adequate to secure a compromise. They would settle, amalgamate with the inhabitants, and convey some instruction to them along with a portion of their languages. It is not necessary to limit such an enterprise to the single adventure of one nation, for in the course of ages there may have occurred several accidents of the same description. One, however, might have sufficed”.<sup>3</sup>

The initial receptions and discussions of the “Preliminary Dissertation” in Crawfurd’s “Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language” appeared to be centred on the intra-linguistic dimension of it; that is, an attention to Crawfurd’s linguistic theory, its epistemic preconditions, and in particular to the linguistic evidence it furnished.

It was within this specific context that Humboldt replaced Marsden as providing the interpretive and ideological contrast to Crawfurd. Apart from offering the most thorough study of the languages in insular Southeast Asia, this recurring return to Humboldt’s analysis also mirrored the high esteem and indeed veneration in which German philology was held in Great Britain at this time.<sup>4</sup> The German connection was acutely expressed in Erskine Perry’s review of Crawfurd’s “Preliminary Dissertation” where a translation of parts of §1 of his book length Introduction to “Über die Kawi Sprache” (“On Language”) took up roughly half of its 20 pages. It would become enunciated in its extreme by F. Max Müller who appropriated Erskine Perry’s approach and inscribed into his own framework within his “The last Results of the Researches respecting Non-Iranian and Non-Semitic Languages of Asia and Europe, or the Turanian family of languages”. This text was first published in the work of another German settled in Great Britain, viz. in baron von Bunsen’s “Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History, Applied to Language and Religion” which composed an integrated part of his seven volume “Christianity and Mankind”.

Crawfurd’s text would, however, a few years later be situated in a quite different context, and the emphasis would then have shifted from language issues and philological subtleties to the very relevancy of language within the study of man, and hence also to the applicative scope of the evidence provided though philology.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crawfurd 1852*, Vol.I, p.cxlx.

<sup>2</sup> In 1852 Crawfurd would thus discuss the linguistic aspect of these issues over more than 10 pages. (*Crawfurd 1852*, Vol.I, pp.cxlvi-cxlix)

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1856*, p.232. (Under the entry ‘Madagascar’)

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. *Burrow 1967*, esp. pp.182-187, and *Stocking 1987*, p.56.

### 3.2.1 Assessing Crawford's Philological Theory: Erskine Perry.

Sir Thomas Erskine Perry (1806-1882) tried to bestow an equal appraisal on both W. von Humboldt and Crawford when he delivered his paper on his brother-in-law's newest publication at the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Company on May 1<sup>st</sup>, 1852.<sup>1</sup> His paper bore the fitting, albeit somewhat lengthy title, "On the Conflicting Views of European Scholars as to the Races Inhabiting Polynesia, and the Indian Archipelago; and as to the Languages Spoken by Them". With this he clearly indicated that, although *language* composed the ostensive object of study, the spatial distribution of the *races* inhabiting these regions, as well as their internal relations, constituted the true subject area. The study of language was thus primarily instrumental, and in the familiar fashion of the scholar-administrator Erskine Perry would embed these studies within a colonial framework where knowledge production and the -implementation were inextricably intertwined. In this quest he endeavoured to bridge the gap between colonial and continental philology by introducing the details of W. von Humboldt's work to an Indian audience.<sup>2</sup> Erskine Perry was at this moment on the verge of returning to Britain, but he still occupied positions as chief justice at the supreme court of Bombay and President of the Indian board of Education,<sup>3</sup> as well as being President of the society in which this paper was delivered; having studied and practised law before going out to India, Erskine Perry had spent some time at the University of Munich in the late 1820s, and it was probably here that he had become acquainted with not only the German language but also the latest theories in philology.<sup>4</sup> In the same volume as where he compared Humboldt's and Crawford's theoretical approaches and derived hypotheses, Erskine Perry also published an article on "The Geographical Distribution of the Languages of India"; this article reflected the same concern about the spatial distribution of the philological and racial data as the one that had structured his comparative approach to Crawford's and Humboldt's texts.<sup>5</sup> Just as it was delineated by Trautmann's notion of locational technologies, it was here the matrix of land, lineage, and language that mattered.

Although Erskine Perry seemed to have conflated Marsden's and Crawford's initial notions of a great Polynesian language<sup>6</sup> – and assumed that they were identical because they shared the same name – he was acutely aware of the radical departure from the genealogical model that Crawford's linguistic studies had taken by 1852. He thus focussed in particular on the racial implications of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Perry, p.242.

<sup>2</sup> Perry thus preceded his translation with the following legitimation: "as the matter [Humboldt's text] is deeply interesting to Indian scholars, and the work has not yet appeared in an English dress, I trust that the Society [that is, the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society] will not deem it unsuitable for this place". (Perry, p.234)

<sup>3</sup> For this and more on Erskine Perry's life and career, see the entry on him in the ODNB. (Barker & prior)

<sup>4</sup> Barker & Prior. Although German philology especially prospered in Prussia and in the middle German states, it was from Munich that J.A. Schmeller worked and produced his famous *spatial mapping* of the Bavarian dialects, and from 1828 he would lecture at the University of Munich. (Benes 2008, pp.128-137)

<sup>5</sup> On Erskine Perry's mapping of languages, its epistemic preconditions and implications, see Irvine, pp.46-47.

<sup>6</sup> Perry, p.243.

Crawfurd's main conclusions; with the exception of the Polynesians who were composed of one race and speaking kindred dialects of the *same* language, Erskine Perry emphasised how Crawfurd always stressed diversity over uniformity – both the brown-complexioned and the black inhabitants of the region were thus each composed of several races, and even within the same race several, *essentially distinct* languages were spoken.<sup>1</sup> Hence language and race constituted two dissociated fields, and language did thus not tell anything about lineage when literally understood as the descent of a blood-line. Language and race were at best only contingently linked through the (pre)historical dissemination of civilization; Erskine Perry drew attention to how “according to Crawfurd's view, the Malayan races have diffused themselves, and *the civilization which they attained by self-derived culture.*”<sup>2</sup>

W. von Humboldt's grand theory provided the anti-thesis to this interpretation. According to Erskine Perry:

“William von Humboldt arrived at the conclusion that [1] *the Malay language was the stem from which the various dialects* spoken by the brown races inhabiting this vast portion of the globe had branched out. [2] He also thought it *an indisputable fact that all these brown races belonged to one family of nations, the Malay*; and [3] in his explanation of *the phenomenon of one race, and one universal language, being thus diffused over such a wide surface of the globe*, and throughout such distantly severed localities, he appears to have supposed that a great convulsion of nature had occurred, by which a mighty continent had been shattered and overwhelmed, leaving only its mountain tops, with a few survivors clinging to them, to constitute the innumerable isles and islets of what had been so happily termed Polynesia.”<sup>3</sup>

Here it was thus a racial and linguistic uniformity and unity that characterized the brown races in the region, and it was intimated that this linguistic unity perhaps went even further by claiming that Humboldt opined “that in all probability the Malayan tongue belonged to what has been latterly termed the Indo-European family of languages.”<sup>4</sup> That this latter may probably more have been expressive of F. Bopp's views<sup>5</sup> than those nurtured by W. von Humboldt, but Erskine went on and intimated that Humboldt's successor, Buschmann, would carry this project even further. According the Erskine Perry, Buschmann announced “that is prepared to show in a forthcoming work, by analogous reasoning, that the various languages of America, which even Humboldt thought were

---

<sup>1</sup> Perry, p.254.

<sup>2</sup> Perry, p.257; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Perry, p.252; my italics.

<sup>4</sup> Perry, p.252.

<sup>5</sup> See Bopp.

distinct, are all closely allied tongues.”<sup>1</sup> This brings out reminiscences to J.D. Lang’s grandiose theory, without any of its overt references to Scriptural authority though. Rather it appeared to be an outcome of Humboldt’s universalist leanings, of the liberal and unifying dimension of his theory which, as we have seen, existed alongside the particularist, dissociating, and inherently hierarchal aspects.

It was in this context that Erskine Perry’s assessment of the hypothesis and linguistic theory of his brother-in-law should be situated. He did not oppose Crawford to Humboldt as much as he posed him as a non-exclusionary alternative; Crawford’s results were not adversary to Humboldt’s as much as they provided a corrective that added to Humboldt’s grander project by substantiating and regulating it according to what Erskine Perry saw as more convincing evidence. Contrasting the authority vested in the two personalities, Erskine Perry emphasised how “the two authors come in conflict in different characters – the one[Humboldt] a profound scholar, with all the information that the closet and devotion to the study of comparative philology can confer; the other [Crawford] a practical man, with accurate personal knowledge of the localities and of the races, and possessing what Humboldt wanted, an intimate acquaintance with the chief vernacular languages on which the inquiry turns.”<sup>2</sup> Erskine Perry thus accentuated the authority derived from Crawford’s embeddedness in the colonial project rather than his resent position as a metropolitan savant, and hence he also simultaneously bolstered his own position – as well as that of the audience present at meeting in the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Company – as a producer of credible, relevant, and applicable colonial knowledge.

So, Erskine Perry in the end appreciated both interpretations, even though he was fully aware that “the conclusions drawn by Mr. Crawford are diametrically opposed to those of William von Humboldt”<sup>3</sup>, and that this in the end followed from fundamentally discrepant theories of language.<sup>4</sup> Methodologically, he seemed to value Crawford’s analysis more than Humboldt’s; “in that the sketch which I have given of the leading views of the two works under discussion may possibly show that the brilliant generalisations of Humboldt are scarcely reconcilable with the facts which the industry of subsequent writers [i.e. Crawford] has brought to light.”<sup>5</sup> Yet this did not invalidate Humboldt’s grand project which aimed, in his own words, “to consider the whole of the human race, without reference to religion, nation, or colour, as one great family – an organic whole, bent on the attainment of a common end – the free development of its mental powers, – this is the grand

---

<sup>1</sup> Perry, pp.252-253.

<sup>2</sup> Perry, p.254.

<sup>3</sup> Perry, p.254.

<sup>4</sup> Perry, pp.255-257. Erskine Perry thus paid much attention to Crawford’s rejection of both the methodology of the word list and of Humboldt’s focus on grammar, as well as he did on Crawford’s own version of the word list containing civilization indicative terms.

<sup>5</sup> Perry, p.259.

and ultimate aim of society”.<sup>1</sup> Erskine Perry unconditionally commended how “grand and animating views like these led the illustrious author to look upon general philology as one of the handmaids by which the nations of the earth might be brought into closer brotherhood”; yet these views needed to be qualified in the light of recent research, and “if the additional body of facts which have been brought to light by Mr. Crawfurd and others demonstrate that the time has not yet arrived for such large and world-comprehensive theories, this conclusion will only accord with the march of science in other departments of knowledge”.<sup>2</sup>

It thus seemed that – instead of perceiving Crawfurd as a staunch racist, nurturing an inveterate resistance to all unifying approaches, such as it followed as a corollary to his fixist and polygenetic framework – it was rather the universalism ingrained in Crawfurd’s civilizationist framework that guided Erskine Perry’s reading and reception of Crawfurd. In other words, even in the 1850s, Erskine Perry continued to inscribe the increasingly racialized views and theories expressed by his fellow in the radical cause, Crawfurd, into the framework of the liberal project of imperialism, despite their discrepant views on e.g. the possibility and desirability of integrating natives in the higher levels of colonial administration.<sup>3</sup>

### **3.2.2 Assessing Crawfurd’s Philological Theory: Max Müller.**

When F. Max Müller wrote the part on the so-called Turanian languages in Baron Bunsen’s “*Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History; Applied to Language and Religion*” two years later, he relied almost exclusively on Erskine Perry’s review when he came to the section of the Malay languages. Max Müller’s discourse thus included a 10 pages long verbatim quotation of Erskine Perry’s translation of W. von Humboldt’s text,<sup>4</sup> and all his quotations of Crawfurd, as well as references to him, were taken from Erskine Perry’s article; indeed Max Müller’s discourse betrays no indication of him having ever read Crawfurd’s “*Preliminary Dissertation*” in its entirety! Max Müller did, however, ascribe Crawfurd’s approach and analysis a prominent place in this discourse, and, although not agreeing with its theoretical foundation, it still played a crucial part in his final assessment.

F. Max Müller (1823-1900) was, if any, the epitome of German philological endeavour on the British islands throughout more than half a century. More than anybody else Max Müller embodied the tenets of German Romanticism in Great Britain; here he exhibited a methodological preference

---

<sup>1</sup> Perry, p.259.

<sup>2</sup> Perry, p.260. Amongst these “others” Erskine Perry explicitly mentioned J.R. Logan and his papers on the “Ethnology of the Indo-Pacific Islands” published in the JIA.

<sup>3</sup> Barker & Prior calls attention to how “Perry accepted the essentially despotic nature of British rule in India, but hoped nevertheless for a display of benevolent liberalism from the British. He repeatedly called for the employment of Indians in the higher levels of the government service.” For more on this topic, see also ch.6 in Koditschek 2011.

<sup>4</sup> This, “so masterly a translation”, was brought in Müller 1854, pp.413-423.

to grammar over etymology in philology which, according to J. Burrow, “can be related to the Romantic concern with grasping phenomena as wholes rather than analysing them into discrete parts.”<sup>1</sup> Having arrived to British isles in 1846 he participated, as already seen, with an important paper at the Oxford meeting of the BAAS in 1847;<sup>2</sup> before gaining a chair at Oxford, first in modern languages in 1854 and from 1868 occupying a chair in comparative philology specially created for him,<sup>3</sup> he teamed up with an other German émigré in England, the Anglophile Baron Bunsen.

The work of Bunsen and Max Müller throughout the 1850s can, as Stocking has pointed out, be regarded as a continuation of the Prichardian paradigm,<sup>4</sup> with its emphasis on a shallow notion of time, a genealogical framework, and a philological approach. Yet Burrow focused, rightly I think, on the German influence in the shape of providing a philosophy of history of a Hegelian type, but here it was added an intense focus on linguistic phenomena and their philological interpretation.<sup>5</sup> It was in the context of his history of mankind, with its on the aspects on the string of continuity between Christianity and ancient Egyptian and Indian religions, that Bunsen coined the concept of *Turanian* as a language category characterized by belonging to the agglutinative stage of language and thought which, furthermore, implied a primitive lack of a sense of individuality.<sup>6</sup> It was left to Max Müller to elaborate on this category; it was thus Max Müller who contributed with the more than 200 pages long disquisition on the Turanian languages to Bunsen’s magnum opus on universal history. Due to ascribed residual definition and amorphous character of *Turanian*,<sup>7</sup> Max Müller abandoned the quest for establishing any genealogical relations between the Turanian languages as well as between the peoples belonging to this *phonological race*;<sup>8</sup> instead he took recourse to the mode of typological classification usually associated with W. von Humboldt’s work.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Burrow 1967, p.186.

<sup>2</sup> Stocking 1987, p.57. The following is in particular based on: Burrow 1967, pp.193-202; Stocking 1987, pp.56-62; Olender, pp.82-92; Trautmann 1997/2004, pp.172-178; Driem, pp.227-233; and Benes 2008, pp.211-221.

<sup>3</sup> See Dowling on Max Müller’s role and influence in Oxford, and on the debates that led up to the election in which he was *not* chosen to occupy the much coveted Boden Chair in Sanskrit in 1860, despite his undeniable qualifications as a philologist. That is, the same year as when Crawford debated with him at the BAAS meeting.

<sup>4</sup> Stocking 1987, p.58.

<sup>5</sup> Burrow 1967, p.195.

<sup>6</sup> Burrow 1967, p.197. See also Driem, p.231.

<sup>7</sup> “By consequence, the Turanian theory lumped together in a single all-encompassing linguistic stock numerous language families as disparate and far-flung as Altaic, Uralic, Yenissian, Daic, Dravidian, Austroasiatic, and language isolates such as Basque and Ainu, as well as the various Palaeosiberian and Caucasian language phyla.” (Driem, p.231) To these Austronesian, including the far-flung Malayo-Polynesian sub-group should also be added.

<sup>8</sup> Max Müller here distinguished explicitly between *phonological race* – defined by a shared language stock, pointing to traceable linguistic ancestors – and *ethnological race* which relied on consanguinity exhibited through kindred physical features. Max Müller held that “ethnological race and phonological race are not commensurate, except in ante-historical times, or perhaps at the very dawn of history.” (Müller 1854, p.349) Hence “there ought to be no compromise of any sort between ethnological and phonological science. It is only by stating the glaring contradictions between the two sciences that truth can be elicited.” (p.351) See Driem, p.30, and Benes 2008, pp.215-216. However, that was exactly what Max Müller often was perceived to do throughout the 1850s and early 1860s by many of his contemporaries!

<sup>9</sup> Stocking 1987, pp.58-59.



As an eminent Sanskritist, the Malay languages did not fall within Max Müller's particular field of experience.<sup>1</sup> He began his analysis by defining the concept of a Turanian language stock as composed of *nomadic languages* which had originated amongst the roaming, non-settled and non-Aryan tribes of central Asia.<sup>2</sup> These were conceptualized in opposition to the so-called *political languages* spoken by the polished nations that had evolved amongst the Indo-European (or Arian as Max Müller called them) and Semitic speaking peoples. Unlike the latter, the former were characterized by being "liable to such rapid changes, and those arising not from phonetical corruption, but from actual loss and a continued reproduction of words"; this implied that "nomadic languages shed their words almost every century, while political languages keep their plumage for thousands of years."<sup>3</sup> Due to this fundamentally discrepant nature, the analysis of these *nomadic languages* (including the identification of cognate linkages between them and the tracing of their spatio-temporal origins) involved a departure from the well established philological methods. The inconstancy of these nomadic languages corresponded neatly with-, and appeared to be causally linked to, the unsettled mode of life and roaming nature of its speakers;<sup>4</sup> rather than perceiving the nomadic languages as "works of art or products of nature" they appeared more to be "mere conglomerates of an irrational chance",<sup>5</sup> and hence they could not be subjected to the same investigative modalities as those traditionally employed in the study of the polished, *political languages*. "To transfer the rules of Arian or Semitic philology to this vast field of linguistic research, would betray an utter ignorance of the nature of language; it would be, as it has been well expressed, like cutting stones with razors."<sup>6</sup> Against such crude entities the sophisticated and finely tuned Indo-European and Semitic philology had, as the analogy aptly accentuated, to give way to coarser approaches; to Max Müller this implied a complete *reversal of the burden of explanation*. Thus, "while in *political languages*, comparative philology has to establish a *principle by which to account for coincidences*", the case was here the opposite and "a *principle must be found in nomadic dialects to account for differences*".<sup>7</sup> This mode of procedure relied heavily of *analogical reasoning* and upon references to contemporary, observable instances amongst "American, Indo-

<sup>1</sup> This "excursion into Turanian philology" would later cause Max Müller's reputation some embarrassment. (*Stocking* 1987, p.59)

<sup>2</sup> Trautmann thus pointed to the fact that Max Müller at one time even traced the etymology of the word 'Turan' to be related to the Sanskrit term for a 'swift horse', and hence referring to nomadic peoples living in the pastoralist stage of society, whereas 'Aryan' was connected to the practice of ploughing – that is, of a sedentary, agricultural style of life. (*Trautmann* 1997/2004, pp.13-14)

<sup>3</sup> Both quotations are from *Müller* 1854, p.403.

<sup>4</sup> Max Müller had earlier in this text quoted W. von Humboldt's dictum on how "every language is a system by which the mind embodies an idea in audible expression. It is the business of the philologist to discover the key to this system. It will then appear that *races* not only express their ideas in the same manner, but follow the same path in their forms of speech" (*Müller* 1854, p.403; my italics)

<sup>5</sup> *Müller* 1854, p.429.

<sup>6</sup> *Müller* 1854, p.429.

<sup>7</sup> *Müller* 1854, p.429; my italics.

Chinese, or Siberian idioms, where we still meet with tribes who, after a short separation, have become unintelligible to one another, and where but few traces remain in their idioms to enable the philologist to discover the common basis from whence all proceeded.”<sup>1</sup>

Max Müller was thus in accordance with Crawfurd in discarding many of the philological methods normally applied in the study of Indo-European languages; yet he dissented fundamentally in determining with what these should be substituted.<sup>2</sup> He refuted Crawfurd’s specific test of linguistic affinity – he did so by providing what seemed to be an actual exemplum in contrarium that invalidated Crawfurd’s test.<sup>3</sup> Neither was he appreciative of the methodology of the word list, though. And especially not when it was applied to the field where it actually seemed to be of most use, viz. that of the often only little known languages spoken by savage people; given that these languages usually belonged to the category of the nomadic languages, they, by their very nature, exhibited a marked propensity towards such rapid, and often arbitrary, changes in their vocabulary that a genealogical affinity would be very hard to trace through this methodology.<sup>4</sup>

Instead he followed Humboldt and others in according a philological primacy of grammar in the determination of linguistic affinity; it was “the grammatical fibres”<sup>5</sup> that constituted the linguistic texture and provided its backbone. On this foundation, Max Müller concluded that “nothing, therefore, but grammatical forms can settle the relationship of languages definitely, and even grammatical forms have occasionally been transferred from one language into another. But in no instance has an entire grammatical system, a complete set of terminations of declensions or conjugation, been appropriated by a foreign tongue, *and where these terminations coincide as a whole, we may be sure that we have to deal with cognate idioms.*”<sup>6</sup> Only then, subsidiary in importance to the evidence provided through grammar, followed the evidence which could be adduced from the civilization-indicating terms included in Crawfurd’s test of linguistic affinity, then came numerals, and lastly the “words expressive of the simplest ideas and the most common objects of every day’s life.”

This paved the way for Max Müller’s refutation of Bopp’s idea of a the Malayo-Polynesian languages being ultimately derived from the Indo-European stock; these languages, and even Malay in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Müller 1854, p.429.

<sup>2</sup> It was a recurring theme in Crawfurd’s discourse that, due to the structural simplicity inherent in all these languages, he was “not disposed to attach much weight” to the analysis of grammatical structure as a test of affinity. (*Crawfurd 1852a*, vol.I, p.iv) Crawfurd and Max Müller thus reached the exact opposite conclusions here.

<sup>3</sup> See Müller 1854, p.426.

<sup>4</sup> Müller 1854, p.427. Max Müller thus stressed that “there are instances where even such words as father and mother, brother and sister, have been replaced by foreign appellations.” That is, essential core words within the word list. Yet he would not go as far as Crawfurd, and he maintained that “on the whole, owing to the familiar and frequent use of these words, people are unwilling to part with them and afraid to replace them by foreign terms not intelligible at first to the whole community.”

<sup>5</sup> Müller 1854, p.412.

<sup>6</sup> Müller 1854, p.427; my italics.

narrow extension of this term, differed from Sanskrit on every essential point of grammar.<sup>1</sup> Instead these languages had to be placed firmly within the Turanian stock, and this could be proved by demonstrating that, in terms of grammatical structure, the “Tai [Thai] and Malay languages may be ranged together”, even without taking recourse to arguments founded upon their geographical proximity, the racial similarities, or a shared lexicography.<sup>2</sup> This did not, however, prove “that Siamese [Thai] and Malay are *lineal descendants* of the same parent”; but it did indicate “that before the dispersion of the descendants of Tur, the nomads of the Pacific received their first grammatical impressions together with the rest of the Turanian family” – meaning that they decidedly pertained to “that branch of the southern Turanian division which occupies the valley of Brahmaputra and extends to the peninsula of Malacca”<sup>3</sup> That is, by and large, what Leyden had earlier termed the Indo-Chinese region.<sup>4</sup>

Operating within this framework of nomadic languages, as opposed to the political languages like those belonging to the Indo-European family, Max Müller followed in the trails of W. von Humboldt (and J.D. Lang too!) in tracing a linguistic (as well as a racial) genealogical affinity between the Indian Archipelago and Polynesia on the one hand and the Asian mainland of the other; an essential affinity long antedating the contingent communication with, and perhaps colonization by, Sanskrit speaking societies belonging to an Indian civilization that resulted in the hybrid nature of the (narrow) Malay language and the flourishing of the Indo-Javanese civilization with its sacred Kawi language. This led him to conjecture:

“The formal coincidences between the Malay and Tai [Thai] grammar here pointed out for the first time, *furnish a link between Asia and Polynesia*, which, even by itself, is *strong enough to hold two of the mightiest chains of languages together*; the *Nomads of the sea*, extending from the east coast of Africa to the west coast of America; the *Nomads of the*

---

<sup>1</sup> Müller 1854, p.412. Instead, the shared elements in grammar and dictionary were “simply imported during a later political and religious intercourse between Arian colonists of India and the Turanian inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago.” (p.404) Before Bopp, Sir William Jones had also, as we saw in Part II, chapter 1, intimated such an essential connection between Malay and Sanskrit, something which Marsden staunchly refuted.

<sup>2</sup> Müller 1854, p.403.

<sup>3</sup> Both quotations are from Müller 1854, p.404.

<sup>4</sup> J.R. Logan would include this notion of a Turanian link between the Asian mainland on the one hand and the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific on the other in his research on the languages and ethnology of the Indo-Pacific islanders; in this context this research assumed a truly global scale of research, encompassing both Europe, Africa, and the Americas. This was especially the case in the parts entitled: (1) “The Ethnology of the Indian Archipelago: Embracing Enquiries into the Continental Relations of the Indo-Pacific Islands” (JIA, vol.IV (1850), pp.25-347); (2) “Ethnology of the Indo-Pacific Islands. Language. Part II: The Races and Languages of S. E. Asia Considered in Relation to Those of the Indo-Pacific Islands”, brought in JIA, vol.VI (1852), pp.653-688; Vol.VII (1853), pp.20-63, 105-137, 186-224, & 301-324; vol.VIII (1854), pp.28-79, 200-265, & 421-504; vol.IX (1855), pp.1-52, 162-272 (& Appendix, pp.1-15), & 359-441; Series II, vol.I (1856), Section II, pp.1-183, & Appendix, pp.-48; and (3) “Ethnology of the Indo-Pacific Islands. The Affiliation of the Tibeto-Burman, Mon-Annam, Papuanesian and Malayo-Polynesian Pronouns and Definitives, as Varieties of the Ancient Himalayo-Polynesian System; and the Relation of That System to the Dravido-Australian” (JIA, Series II, vol.III (1859), pp.65-100)

*Continent* swarming from the south-east to the north-west of Asia. But further researches will strengthen this link, and add new traces of their *common origin*".<sup>1</sup>

Max Müller reached this conclusion through a quite eclectic reading of Humboldt's and Crawford's texts and a rather idiosyncratic extraction of evidence from them. Indeed, in giving the impression of mediating between the interpretations offered by Humboldt and Crawford, Max Müller actually employed them in a manifestly Hegelian manner as constituting two antithetical approaches that were subsequently dissolved, reformulated, and accorded a new meaning when they became inscribed into Max Müller's own synthesis. "The philosophical mind of Humboldt" was, as Max Müller stressed, "always turned toward the problem of unity of language", whereas "Mr. Crawford approaches the subject from the very opposite point, as a careful observer, awake to what is peculiar in each dialect, and anxious rather to distinguish than to combine."<sup>2</sup> Yet, equipped with the right analytical tools, such a discrepancy could be advantageously exploited:

"Nothing is more useful to the progress of scientific discovery than the cooperation of men following principles so antagonistic. They mutually check and correct one another. While Humboldt thought already of linking the whole [Malayo-]Polynesian family with the Arian through the medium of Sanskrit, Mr. Crawford shows that the [Malayo-]Polynesian dialects themselves have not yet been definitely traced to one common source. But the disparity of dialects which rivets Mr. Crawford's eye, disappears in great part under the comprehensive grasp of a scholar like Humboldt. *Their methods, though different, will tend in the end to elicit the fact, that languages apparently unconnected in grammar and dictionary, can yet be reclaimed and comprehended under one common name by the discovery of a few characteristic features, which it would be impossible to consider as the result of mere accident.*"<sup>3</sup>

Rather than perceiving the relationship between Humboldt and Crawford as merely that of a metropolitan knowledge producer versus a more peripheral information provider, they constituted a symbiotic binary when interpreted adequately. And Max Müller ascribed himself the role of the purveyor of this adequate interpretation. Hence, "*if the Malay is thus secured to the Turanian family, the whole question of its connection with the Polynesian languages will have to be viewed in a new light*, and the conflicting opinions of Humboldt and Crawford may receive a solution consistent both with that fundamental unity which struck the comprehensive genius of the former,

---

<sup>1</sup> Müller 1854, p.48; my italics. These traces would, however, only be few and weak given the innate unstable nature of these nomadic languages.

<sup>2</sup> Müller 1854, p.423.

<sup>3</sup> Müller 1854, pp.423-424; my italics. Regarding "the question of the common origin of the language of the Malay [race], the inhabitants of the more eastern islands of the South Sea [i.e. Polynesia], the Negritos, and Haraforas" Max Müller took a reserved, yet decidedly pro-Humboldtian stance, and thought that his "work has laid open so many traces of relationship". (p.428)

and the startling discrepancy of local varieties that attracted the notice of so patient a collector and so careful an investigator as Mr. Crawfurd.”<sup>1</sup>

Crawfurd was thus acknowledged as, before anything else, a philologist rather than as a staunch racist by his future foe! This early exchange of views between Crawfurd and Max Müller showed no signs of the rancour and ridicule that characterized their confrontation in the early 1860s. On the contrary, Max Müller seemed to cherish Crawfurd’s focus on the particular and on the non-traceability of a common source of origin as a useful corrective to Humboldt’s all-embracing inclinations; that is, when embedded within Max Müller’s own interpretive framework, Crawfurd’s research provided a temporary and partial truth which facilitated his own, higher synthesis.

### 3.2.3 Convergent Contexts: Luke Burke’s Racialized Reading of Crawfurd.

The manner in which “Mr. Crawfurd’s masterly ‘Preliminary Dissertation’”<sup>2</sup> was received in the article printed in the *Westminster Review* in 1856 stood in stark contrast to two the intra-linguistic readings of it discussed above. It was reviewed together with J.C. Nott’s (1804-1873) and G.R. Gliddon’s (1809-1857) “Types of Mankind”, probably the best known publication associated with the so-called American (or Philadelphia) School of anthropology, and this obviously situated Crawfurd’s text within a different context. Although it, according to the author of the review, “would be difficult to point out a more just application of philological knowledge than the one embraced in the ‘Preliminary Dissertation’”,<sup>3</sup> it was not the subtleties of philological analysis that concerned reviewer. He had quite another agenda; instead, its primary preoccupation was with race, and on how racial differences provided evidence in favour the existence of essential, innate differences between the races which again, perhaps, pointed to several different origins of mankind.

Written in commemoration of S.G. Morton (1799-1851), and containing an important contribution from L. Agassiz (1807-1873),<sup>4</sup> the “Types of Mankind” encompassed texts written by all of the most important members of the American school. As most vociferous propagators of a purely scientific polygenism – thoroughly cleansed from any references to Scriptural authority or to the genealogical framework that grew out this tradition – the American School aspired to found an anthropological science that focussed almost entirely on the measurable aspects of physical man.<sup>5</sup> The School was committed to a fixist notion of race<sup>6</sup> and a biological polygenism;<sup>1</sup> this resulted in,

---

<sup>1</sup> Müller 1854, p.412; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Burke, p.386.

<sup>3</sup> Burke, p.373.

<sup>4</sup> Agassiz wrote an article entitled “Of the Natural Provinces of the Animal World and Their Relation to the Different Types of Man”. (Nott & Gliddon 1854, pp.lviii-lxxvi) Despite its relative brevity, it appeared to be one of the more cogent articles in the book – a fact illustrated by the space accorded to it in this article.

<sup>5</sup> The following is based on Haller, pp.69-86; Kidd 2006, pp.144-147; and Livingstone 2008, pp.170-186.

<sup>6</sup> The review emphasized how Morton’s inquiries provided “accumulated and extended evidence” of the permanence of organic types in the human families” (Burke, p.362; see p.363 for an elaboration of the argument)

as emphasized by D.N. Livingstone, that “the collective endeavours of the American School, however short-lived their scientific standing, brought a variety of additional devices into discussion.” These included “statistical measurement, visual imagery, and the cultivation of what might be called moral cartography”.<sup>2</sup> As such they evidently had a lot in common with Crawford, both in terms of theoretical stance, approaches, and fields of interest – despite evincing glaring disagreements in important ideological questions, such as the one regarding slavery.<sup>3</sup> Using a rhetoric based on statistical argumentation had always been a specialty of Crawford’s, and a racialized geography had also constituted a recurring theme throughout Crawford’s entire career, as it has been convincingly argued by especially D.N. Livingstone.<sup>4</sup>

J.C. Nott had, furthermore, referred to “my friend Mr. Crawford” with whom he apparently had corresponded.<sup>5</sup> And three years later, in the “Indigenous Races of the Earth” published in 1857, G.R. Gliddon would refer triumphantly to Crawford’s categorization “of the Malayan tongues, segregating this group victoriously from all others” as incontestable evidence in support of the polygenist hypothesis.<sup>6</sup> Gliddon based this assessment upon an article written by the French L.F.A. Maury (1817-1892), “On the Distribution and Classification of Tongues”, published in the same book.<sup>7</sup> Here Maury emphasized that “if the high authority of Mr. John Crawford were to be passed over in Malayan subjects, our argument would lack completeness.”<sup>8</sup> Crawford’s influence, however, was estimated as more than merely being that of an expert on a local subject; indeed, “what singularly commends Crawford’s analytical investigations to the ethnographer is the careful method through which, by well-chosen and varied comparative vocabularies”.<sup>9</sup> Maury esteemed Crawford’s contribution not merely for its methodological acumen, but rather for its wider scientific and ideological implications:

---

<sup>1</sup> Apart from Morton’s contributions, the reviewer in particular stressed how Professor Agassiz had fully succeeded in demonstrating the diversity of races, and how each race was originally accorded its own geographical realm, just like the different species of animals. (Burke, pp.363-366; see also Livingstone 2008, pp.95-97)

<sup>2</sup> Livingstone 2008, p.175.

<sup>3</sup> As it is also emphasized in Ellingson, p.269. Furthermore, see the preceding chapter of this dissertation.

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Livingstone 1991 and Livingstone 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Nott & Gliddon 1854, p.415; quoted in the article on the “Comparative Anatomy of Races”. (pp.411-465)

<sup>6</sup> Nott & Gliddon 1857, p.425. (In “The Monogenists and Polygenists: Being an Exposition of the Doctrines of Schools Professing to Sustain Dogmatically the Unit or the Diversity of Human Races; with an Inquiry into the Antiquity of Mankind upon Earth; Viewed Chronologically, Historically and Palæontologically”, pp.402-602).

<sup>7</sup> In its entirety the title was: “On the Distribution and Classification of Tongues, – Their Relation to the Geographical Distribution of Races; and on the Inductions which May be Drawn from These Relations”. (Nott & Gliddon 1857, pp.25-86)

<sup>8</sup> Nott & Gliddon 1857, p.70. With “our argument” Maury here referred to both to his own linguistic analysis that sought to include all new research, including Crawford’s, on “those *families* of tongues to which the name “Malayo-Polynesian” has been applied (my italics), as well as to the general polygenetic argument defended throughout the whole volume.

<sup>9</sup> Nott & Gliddon 1857, p.80. The phrase continued: “he has succeeded in showing, how *Malayan blood, language and influence*, decrease in the exact ratio that, from their continental peninsula of Malacca, as a starting point, their colonizing propensities have since widened the diameter between their own primitive cradle, and their present commercial factories, or piratical nuclei.”

“Being one of the few Englishmen, morally brave enough to avow, as well as being sufficiently learned to sustain, by severely-scientific argument, *polygenistic doctrines on the origin of mankind*, Mr. Crawford’s ethnological opinions are entitled to the more respect from his fellow-philologues, inasmuch as – without dispute a vague appellative, “Malayo-Polynesian,” – his philosophic deductions must logically tally with those continental views, to which a Franco-Germanic utterance is given at the close of our section IIIId.”<sup>1</sup>

So, after all, it was perhaps not that surprising when Crawford’s “Preliminary Dissertation” became coupled with “Types of Mankind” in the article in *Westminster Review* in spite of their thematic discrepancies. Especially not when it is considered who authored the review. It appeared to have been written by Luke Burke<sup>2</sup> who by 1856 had championed a racialized and polygenetic view for a long time. Albeit lesser known than, for instance, W. Lawrence,<sup>3</sup> R. Knox,<sup>4</sup> or J. Hunt,<sup>5</sup> Luke Burke was nonetheless one of the most insistent expounders of the polygenetic doctrine in the British realm from the 1840s and onwards. Burke had published his own “Ethnological Journal” which appeared sporadically throughout the 1840s and 1850s,<sup>6</sup> and he would become a member of the inner circle who, led by J. Hunt and Crawford, staged what T. Ellingson, somewhat dramatically, has termed the ‘coup’ of the Prichardian dominated Ethnological Society around 1858-1860.<sup>7</sup> Whether a dramatic coup or a merely a pacific take-over of an ailing society by new, more dynamic people, it did imply an attempt at implementing many of the theories and methodological approaches associated with the ‘American School’ in a British context. “Anthropological theories of human origins throughout the nineteenth century were inevitably swept up into political arenas and were mobilized in the service of geopolitical agendas”.<sup>8</sup> Crawford proved to be instrumental in the introduction of these thoughts into the London-based learned societies; this was not at least due to his position as a cultural go-between and theoretical mediator

<sup>1</sup> *Nott & Gliddon 1857*, p.80; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Luke Burke is thus identified as the author of this article in the *Wellesley Index*, vol.V, p.121.

<sup>3</sup> A staunch materialist and contemporary of Crawford, the comparative anatomist W. Lawrence (1783-1867) had in his earlier lectures vigorously defended human unity, but by the 1850s he had become “convinced of the diversity of human origin” (quoted in *Douglas & Ballard*, p.56) and of the fixity of races (p.60).

<sup>4</sup> Among the many writings on Knox’s racist theories, their ideological implications, and intellectual contexts, see especially *Richards*. See also, e.g., *Brantlinger 2003*, pp.39-44.

<sup>5</sup> The career J. Hunt and his involvement in the establishment of the Anthropological Society have been dealt with in many texts, but it is in *Ellingson* that it is most thoroughly addressed.

<sup>6</sup> According to Stocking, L. Burke issued this journal for the first time in 1848 after which it quickly stopped being published. (*Stocking 1987*, p.64) Yet at least by 1854 it had resuscitated, even if only for a short while. L. Burke contributed himself with most of the articles in these journals. (See also *Ellingson*, p.305)

<sup>7</sup> This was the recurring theme of the latter part of Ellingson’s book. (*Ellingson*, chapters 13-19) The very existence of this ‘dramatic event’, however, rested on a rather precarious footing, as Ellingson himself admitted. In the absence of sources directly referring to, or actually implicated in, such a ‘coup’, Ellingson instead relied on mediated inferences that, after a reading of the available source-material, led him to conclude that “we cannot escape the implication of a deliberately manipulated crisis.” This, again, prompted an approach where “in the best Victorian fashion, then, let us fall back on conjecture and hypothesize that a ‘coup’ was deliberately engineered and executed during and after the 1858 meeting [at the Ethnological Society].” (*Ellingson*, p.275)

<sup>8</sup> *Livingstone 2011*, pp.187-188.

between the reigning philologically oriented and philanthropically inclined proponents of the Prichardian paradigm on the one hand, and on the other the often medically trained, iconoclastic, hard-core racialists with their unilateral focus on anatomy and a static hierarchy of races.<sup>1</sup> Crawford's position as a prominent former scholar-administrator and an accomplished Orientalist helped to pave the way into the polished environment of the learned societies for these, otherwise unconnected and socially marginalised, advocates of a racialized version of scientific polygenism;<sup>2</sup> an entry which was undoubtedly further eased by Crawford's legendary "diplomatic charm and personal warmth".<sup>3</sup>

Notwithstanding whether the result of a premeditated and carefully executed plan, or merely the contingent outcome of more or less arbitrary acts, gaining Crawford's support seemed to have been crucial to the British advocates of the tenets of the 'American School'. Luke Burke's article in the *Westminster Review* in 1856 could thus have been one of the first attempts by these to discursively tie Crawford's philological and ethnological research to their own agenda.

Although not accorded much space (only some 6 pages out of a total of 30), Crawford's "Preliminary Dissertation" nevertheless had a significant discursive function in Burke's article. It provided philological evidence, produced by a renowned British authority, which allegedly corroborated the same hypotheses as those which had been asserted upon racial evidence in the American "Types of Mankind". Adjoining Crawford's philological dissertation to these American theories would thus confer an authority to them that they otherwise would probably not possess when articulated in the British intellectual realm, dominated by the London Based learned societies and the BAAS.

In his review of Crawford's "Preliminary Dissertation", Burke took his point of departure in the, by now, well known Humboldt-Crawford dichotomy. Humboldt, however, had, to a certain extent, been replaced by Prichard who, as the British appropriator of Humboldt's theories, had elaborated further upon these by applying the term "'Malayo-Polynesian' to all those nations of the Great Southern Ocean whose dialects have been found to bear an affinity to the language of the Malays".<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Despite being looked upon with some reserve by the Prichardian inclined ethnologists – due to his staunchly materialist views, deviant linguistic theories, and fixist notions of race (*Ellingson*, p.265) – Crawford, nonetheless "remained closer to the orientation of the Prichard-Hodgkin school of ethnology, with its pronounced philological and cultural emphases, than to Hunt and his followers." (*Ellingson*, pp.268-269)

<sup>2</sup> James Hunt (1833-1869) was thus a young medical school dropout without any significant social affiliations before hooking up with Crawford in the mid 1850s. (*Ellingson*, p.265) Hunt's role model (*Rainger*, pp.56-57), R. Knox's peripheral position is well known; his implication in the 'Burke and Hare murders', as the unknowing purchaser of the corpses of their victims which he bought from them for anatomical purposes, had estranged him from finer society; a marginalisation that only became reified by his militantly racialized and overtly racist views such as these were expressed in, for instance, his "Races of Men" (1850). In 1855 he was thus 'blackballed' (not admitted) by the Ethnological Society, only to be reinstated in 1858. (mentioned in *Hunt 1868*, p.434, and, among many other places, mentioned in *Stocking 1987*, pp.242-243)

<sup>3</sup> *Ellingson*, p.262.

<sup>4</sup> *Burke*, p.373.



This had resulted in “perhaps the most sweeping conclusion in the whole domain of philology” which, furthermore, even represented “a conclusion formed in the face of certain diversities in physical characters.”<sup>1</sup> By rhetorically posing Prichard as the main antagonist (despite the fact that Crawford did not refer to him at all in his “Preliminary Dissertation”!), Burke situated “the refutation of this hypothesis”<sup>2</sup> in a context where this would also imply a negation of Prichard’s theories. Or, in other words, Crawford had, according to Burke, through his intimate local knowledge and “laborious method”,<sup>3</sup> accomplished to destabilize the reigning Prichardian paradigm through evidence adduced from its own preferred field of philology. Crawford’s studies had resulted in what Burke considered “the most substantial progressive step in the philological branch of ethnology taken in recent times”,<sup>4</sup> and which had caused the overthrow the authoritative “hypothesis which had at first the appearance of being based on profound learning and research – probably as great learning and research as could have been found out of the limits of a practical and intimate personal acquaintance with the subject discussed.”<sup>5</sup> And Crawford’s philologically based conclusions were furthermore seen as “quite in agreement with the investigation carried on of late year in the United States”, having led to the conviction that “in this extensive part of the globe [between Madagascar and Easter Island], there are numerous distinct races of men.”<sup>6</sup> To Burke this was the crucial part of Crawford’s discourse; that the notion of race, and the multiplicity of their numbers, automatically enforced itself upon his research, “although his labours were not based on physical characteristics”, but on language.<sup>7</sup>

Hence, notwithstanding whether he was aware of it or not, Mr. Crawford’s ethnological conclusions came “in support of the doctrines of Mr. Morton and others” of the American School, and in conjunction with these it was conceived to herald a new and glorious era in the history of science. An era in which the end of ethnology was to produce “a classification and arrangement of the races of man that will be comprehensive and to be relied upon.”<sup>8</sup>

Through the notion “of the essential diversity of human races”, Burke then continued by linking the theories advanced by the American School of anthropology and the one that seemed to be suggested in Crawford’s “Preliminary Dissertation” to R. Knox’s hyper-racialized discourse. Through this connection Luke Burke linked the multiplicity of languages and races causally to civilization; race thus sternly determined the form of civilization as well as it sharply delineated its

---

<sup>1</sup> Burke, p.374.

<sup>2</sup> Burke, p.375.

<sup>3</sup> Burke, p.376.

<sup>4</sup> Burke, p.377.

<sup>5</sup> Burke, p.377.

<sup>6</sup> Burke, p.377.

<sup>7</sup> Burke, p.377.

<sup>8</sup> Burke, p.378.

potential scope. Race was, in R. Knox's words, everything,<sup>1</sup> and civilization manifested itself as well as prospered strictly according to its racial potential; some races were indeed deemed to be "so low in the scale of improvability that they are totally incapable for its [i.e. civilization's] reception."<sup>2</sup> Reading Crawford in the sombre light of R. Knox's insidious shadow hence led to an altogether different conclusion, implying a hardcore racial determinism, than the ones which resulted from Erskine Perry's and Max Müller's readings of the same text.

To a certain extent, although they shared the same geographical space when consuming the exact same text, Luke Burke's reading of Crawford deviated from Erskine Perry's and Max Müller's to such an extent that it seemed to suggest that they occupied quite different interpretive communities;<sup>3</sup> in conjunction these, then, constituted a larger, contested space of interpretation where the conflicting epistemes clashed. By looking into the production, circulation, and receptions of Crawford's texts I have attempted to elucidate the dynamics of the spatialized hermeneutics of this specific instance of ethnological communication in the British realm during the 1850s.<sup>4</sup>

By the 1860s the turn of these interlocked processes of production, circulation, and reception had become full; the clear shift in both rhetoric and content in Crawford's texts published throughout this latter decade thus appears to me to have been profoundly influenced by such exactly readings as the one by Luke Burke which has been analysed here. T. Ellingson has, in my opinion, a very valid point when he suggested that "Crawford's acceptance of the idea of human races as constituting distinct species may, in fact, have only developed under the influence of his association with [James] Hunt."<sup>5</sup>

As I have attempted to demonstrate throughout this dissertation, a concept of linguistic polygenism exerted a steady influence in Crawford's textual production throughout his entire career, and a notion of biological polygenism lurked there as well, albeit its discursive importance did only grow gradually – especially in after 1834 when its explanative potential became increasingly exploited. Yet a profoundly biologized discourse, with its tendency to analogize or identify races with species, did not become important in Crawford's writings until after the publication of the "Preliminary Dissertation" and the "Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries". That is, not until the reception of Crawford's discourses underwent a marked change as demonstrated by such hyper-racialized readings as Luke Burke's and J. Hunt's.

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Richards*, pp.391-396.

<sup>2</sup> *Burke*, pp.378-379.

<sup>3</sup> On the notion of *interpretive communities* sharing hermeneutic strategies in a context of 19<sup>th</sup> C. science, see *Livingstone* 2011, p.179.

<sup>4</sup> See also *Livingstone* 2007, pp.73-76 for a discussion of the aspects of textual production, circulation, and consumption/reception in the study of the geographies of the reading of scientific texts.

<sup>5</sup> *Ellingson*, pp.267-268.

Whatever Crawford may at the time have thought about the intimate linking between his own study of the Oceanic languages and the tenets of the American School of anthropology, such as it was intimated in Luke Burke's article, this linking did prove to have an aftermath in the American theatre.

When J.L. Cabell (1813-1889), a professor of anatomy at the University of Virginia, published his "The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind" in 1859, he referred to Crawford as the foremost provider of linguistic evidence in support of a polygenetic doctrine; this assertion was mainly based on the article in the *Westminster Review* authored by Luke Burke. Cabell's book was firmly situated in an American intellectual setting where Nott and Gliddon's scientific polygenism, despite its pro-slavery stance,<sup>1</sup> met its fiercest opposition among southern pro-slavery traditionalists like Cabell who preferred to legitimate this institution rather through "a literal reading of scripture, than in risky speculations of ultra-racist polygenesis."<sup>2</sup> It was within this context that Cabell published his book with an intention to counter both secular polygenism and scriptural revisionism through arguments grounded equally in a literal reading of the Scriptures and in modern scientific evidence.<sup>3</sup>

Cabell did not perceive Crawford as radical as for instance Agassiz in his pro-polygenism rhetoric, but he did nevertheless present him as the proponent of a more sophisticated philological argument in favour of polygenism.<sup>4</sup> Cabell thus lauded Crawford's initial insistence on language being neither a test of- nor identical with race.<sup>5</sup> Yet this was followed by a unequivocal refutation of Crawford's general interpretation and methodological approach; according to Cabell both gave rise to a bias which resulted from "the exaggerated estimate he formed of the difficulties in the way of accepting the doctrine of the unity of these races". Cabell further argued, "under the influence of this prejudice he [Crawford] set about seeking for some other explanation of the verbal coincidences in their languages which rests upon the belief in their common origin".<sup>6</sup> In short, Crawford had, according to Cabell, construed both his methodology and interpretive framework in order to comply with his preconceived, "purely gratuitous" principles of polygenism.<sup>7</sup> Opposed to this, Cabell put the monogenetic, genealogical theories and philological methodologies "so perspicuously put by Dr. Prichard", and which were the product of "a rigorous induction based on a

---

<sup>1</sup> Unlike the pro-slavery legitimations of the other members, L. Agassiz explicitly rejected to imbue his scientific results with any political interest whatsoever, including with regard to the slavery question. (*Livingstone* 2008, p.95)

<sup>2</sup> *Kidd* 2006, p.145.

<sup>3</sup> *Livingstone* 2008, p.181.

<sup>4</sup> See *Cabell*, pp.196-203 for a refutation of Agassiz's argument of a physiologically induced discrepancy in the linguistic abilities among the different races who, allegedly, were equipped with slightly different organs of speech.

<sup>5</sup> *Cabell*, pp.203-204.

<sup>6</sup> Both quotes are from *Cabell*, p.208.

<sup>7</sup> *Cabell*, pp.218-219.

most careful study of all the known languages of man.”<sup>1</sup> Apart from Prichard’s paper delivered at the BAAS meeting at Oxford in 1847, Cabell referred, either directly or indirectly, to both Bunsen’s and Max Müller’s papers delivered there too;<sup>2</sup> all of these were presented as the latest outcomes of an accomplished tradition inaugurated by Leibniz and carried on by the likes of “the Adelungs, Vater, Klaproth, Frederick Schlegel, Bopp, and Jacob Grimm”, as well as “William von Humboldt” to whom they owed “its greatest extension and the character of a profound philosophical investigation.”<sup>3</sup> In sum, the evidence produced by this proud tradition of profound philological inquiry guided by a monogenist, genealogical framework proved to be staggering when compared to what Cabell presented a Crawford’s lone figure and biased approach.

Then, based on Bunsen’s discourse, Cabell continued with a denunciation of the principles of the materialist-biological theory of the origin of language, with its equation between the savage and the original state of society as well as with the foundational notion of progression. That is, the framework which rendered a linguistic polygenism possible. Operating within an explicitly narrow notion of time, the idea of a gradual development of language was dismissed as a logical impossibility; instead, he asserted that philological evidence showed “that the languages of savages are degraded, decaying fragments of nobler formations.”<sup>4</sup> Language, in short, was divinely instituted, and they all stemmed from the same root; the origin of this could be traced back to the same “nations which from the dawn of history to our days have been the leaders of *civilization* in Asia, Europe, and Africa”<sup>5</sup>, and whose origin should be located somewhere in the region around ancient Egypt.

Although Cabell’s book was firmly embedded in an American context, and he primarily directed his arguments against the scientifically based polygenetic theories expounded by the American School, the part on philology actually remained firmly grounded in Anglo-Germanic texts and in their contexts of conflict. Ironically, then, it seemed to have been the English admirer of Nott and Gliddon, Luke Burke, who, in his attempt to accommodate their controversial theories in a British context, paved the way for Cabell’s appropriation and the discussion of the “Malayo-Polynesian problem”; this was then invoked in the debates on the origin of man such as these were materialised within a pro-slavery and traditionalist framework that characterized the Southern states of USA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cabell, p.219.

<sup>2</sup> Cabell, pp.211, 215-216, 221-222, & 223-232. Cabell had apparently only an indirect access to Max Müller’s paper through an article published in the Southern Quarterly Review in Jan., 1855.

<sup>3</sup> Cabell, p.212.

<sup>4</sup> Cabell, p.228. For more on Bunsen’s and Max Müller’s theories on an original linguistic perfection and subsequent degeneration, see also Burrow 1967, pp.193 & 196-202, and Stocking 1987, pp.56-62.

<sup>5</sup> Cabell, p.231; my italics.

### 3.3 J.R. Logan's Notions of Race, Language, and Civilization.

This is not the place to dwell too long upon the convoluted contexts, complex discursive rationales, and (meagre) implications of J.R. Logan's theorizing on an aggravated scale within the confines of the colonial periphery of Singapore. Yet, I will end my analysis of the discursive moment in the 1850s by looking into Logan's relationship with Crawford and with a brief commentary on Logan's definition and uses of the concept of race in the initial articles of his magnum opus.

Logan's journal, the JIA, was, as already mentioned, often referred to and relied upon both in texts published in Great Britain as well as on the European continent.<sup>1</sup> This evidently suggested a very cogent reception of this journal, despite of its peripheral position in terms of colonial geography and despite its lack of the official patronage that for instance the publication of the Asiatic Society of Bengal had earlier enjoyed. The JIA was before anything else the product of the indefatigable endeavours of single, unaffiliated individual, J.R. Logan (1819-1869). Born in Scotland and trained in law, Logan arrived at Penang in 1839, and moved on to Singapore in 1843; here he practiced as a lawyer and edited the Pinang Gazette before founding the JIA in 1847.<sup>2</sup> Throughout the entire existence of the JIA (1847-1863), Logan financed it at considerable personal expense",<sup>3</sup> and he served both as its editor and as the main contributor of articles. Apart from a vast array of other articles – encompassing any topic dealing with the geology, geography, ethnology, or philology of the Indian Archipelago, the Pacific Islands, and eastern Asia – Logan also embarked upon a comprehensive project of great magnitude, dedicated to the theoretical aspects concerning the question regarding the elements of unity and diversity exhibited in the languages and ethnology within this vast region, and which may collectively be termed "the languages and ethnology of the Indo-Pacific islanders".<sup>4</sup> Between 1847 and 1859 he would thus continue to publish articles under different heading, but all addressing the more abstract or general aspects of this topic. In total, this

---

<sup>1</sup> I have throughout the text given plenty examples of this. Yet the journal was never published in any great numbers; according to W.S. Tiew, "during its publishing history, an average of 200 to 300 copies were published and distributed within the region. However, out of this issue, about 50 copies are taken up by the East India company for the benefit of its officers of the government in the Straits Settlement." (Tiew, pp.21-22. Tiew, however, does not provide any references to his source for these numbers!) Given these scarce numbers, the amount as well as the geographical range of the references to JIA amongst geographers, orientalist, and philologists seem all the more surprising; perhaps some of these references were of an indirect nature, and they were merely the result of the reading of other texts which had then referred to JIA. Yet, even if this is true, this does not detract from its cogent impact; on the contrary, it underpins the high esteem in which the content of this journal was generally held.

<sup>2</sup> This information is primarily based on Chia, and on Jones 1973 pp.99-103.

<sup>3</sup> Turnbull 1972, p.26. See also Turnbull 1969, pp.17-19.

<sup>4</sup> In this very title Ballantyne sees a continuous tendency to establish a cultural and linguistic linking of this zone to India; an approach which had also been followed by Leyden and Crawford. (Ballantyne 2002, p.62) Crawford's view was, however, as I have endeavoured to demonstrate, somewhat more complex.

would amount to more than 1,100 densely written pages; or, in other words, in terms of sheer quantity, it was only surpassed by W. von Humboldt's work.<sup>1</sup>

However, the JIA seemed to have been evaluated higher for providing informed intelligence about the Southeast Asian realm – its geography, people, languages, and history – rather than for the sweeping synthesis of the kind represented in Logan's more theoretical series of articles. In other words, it was valued as a reliable source of information based on an extensive and specialized local knowledge, rather than as a venue for wider theorizing.<sup>2</sup> Yet this did not detain Logan from issuing his own elaborate alternative to the metropolitan theories, albeit this may not have been as widely read as (and they were definitely less quoted than) his more mundane commentaries on geography, history, ethnology, and language.<sup>3</sup>

Crawfurd's relationship to Logan appears to aptly illustrate this point. In the "Preface" to his "preliminary Dissertation" Crawfurd paid his acknowledgement to those who had assisted him in the work, and here he situated Logan on par with his illustrious predecessor, W. Marsden, and H.H. Wilson upon whose "unrivalled oriental learning" Crawfurd had relied in questions regarding Sanskrit etymologies, grammar etc.. Both Marsden and Wilson, former president of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and who since 1829 had occupied the Boden Chair in Sanskrit at Oxford,<sup>4</sup> pertained to the scholarly elite in Great Britain, and their association alone could assist in imbuing Crawfurd's present work with further authority.<sup>5</sup> Logan's name, on the other hand, could attribute more authenticity to it. It seemed primarily to be in this capacity that Crawfurd emphasized Logan's contribution when he stated that:

---

<sup>1</sup> This immensely interesting instance of systematic knowledge production and linguistic theory making in the colonial periphery has, according to my best knowledge, not yet been subjected to any thorough historical examination. Needless to add that many interesting insights would most probably result from such a study!

<sup>2</sup> An exception to this was Erskine Perry's reference to "a very interesting series of papers on the 'Ethnology of the Indo-Pacific Islands', now in the course of publication in the Journal of the Indian Archipelago, by its able editor, Dr. Logan." (Perry, p.260) Nowhere else is there any mentioning of Logan being entitled to call himself 'doctor'. In his "Glossology", published in 1858 and originally intended by the author to supplant Horne Tooke's etymological theory, the former chief justice on Malta, Sir Robert Stoddart (1773-1856), explicitly appropriated Logan's notion of an Indo-Pacific region and his division of it into seven philologically defined, geographical sub-regions. (Stoddart, pp.16-17) On Stoddart's life and career, I have relied on the article on him ODNB (Boase & Banerji)

<sup>3</sup> The only addressing of "Logan's theorizing of ethnology and the nation in the 1840s" and 1850s, that I am aware of, is G. Knapman's historicised discussion of the importance of Logan's Christian cosmogony and his notions of the Great Chain of Being upon the approaches and conclusions within his ethnological writings. (Knapman 2008b)

<sup>4</sup> On H.H. Wilson's presidency, see *Kejariwal*, pp.118-161, and for the politics involved in his election to the Boden Chair, see *Trautmann 2009a*, pp.201-205 (in the article "The Missionary and the Orientalist", pp.189-207)

<sup>5</sup> Crawfurd appeared to have referred to Wilson for the first time in his two published travelogues (*Crawfurd 1828a*, pp.360, 366, & 367, and *Crawfurd 1829a*, p.69). Then he was always merely referred to as "Mr. Wilson", followed by lauding descriptions. References to Wilson in *Crawfurd 1852a* (pp.viii, xxxvii, lviii, & cxc) and *Crawfurd 1856* (pp.102, 148, 243, 412, & 439) were all, without exception, preceded by a "my friend", as if to accentuate the close ties to this recognized Orientalist. Parts of their correspondence from 1846 to 1860 can be consulted in the British Library, India Office Library and Records, Private Papers, Mss Eur E301.

“During the progress of my work, I have had the good fortune to enjoy the correspondence of my friend J. Robert<sup>1</sup> Logan, of Singapore, the editor of the *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, a work abounding in original and authentic communications. Our present rapid intercourse with India has enabled me, when at a loss, to refer to Mr. Logan; and *I have received from him elucidations of grammar, and additional words, accompanied by definitions.*”<sup>2</sup>

Although Crawfurd at times referred to, for instance, “the learned Mr. Logan”<sup>3</sup> in his “Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries”, a closer reading of these instances reveals that they, nonetheless, still concerned issues more regarding ‘facts’ than ‘interpretations’, and hence they, despite the unequivocally expressed respect and admiration, remained firmly embedded on the information level.<sup>4</sup>

Logan’s references to his connection with Crawfurd, tell a slightly different story, though. In an article on “Introductory Remark to a Series of Contributions to the Ethnology of the Indian Archipelago”, which appeared in the first volume of JIA, Logan referred to a letter he had received from Crawfurd. In the letter Crawfurd discussed the content and purpose of his latest essay on the races and languages of the Indian Archipelago and Polynesian Islands; that is, the very essay that would later be read at the BAAS meeting at Oxford and published the following year.<sup>5</sup> The content of the letter replicated was in a footnote to the article, and it suggested a relation on a much more equal footing between the two; instead, it conveyed the impression of constituting a part of an ongoing theoretical discussion on the ethnology of the Indian Archipelago – especially regarding procurement of data, interpretation of evidence, and the establishment of substantiated hypotheses.

In terms of self-perception and scientific ambition, it thus seems that Logan aspired to be less like the vocabulary and grammar producing – and hence, to a certain extent, ‘merely’ information providing – missionaries and more like the renowned scholar-administrator B. Hodgson. From his peripheral abodes in first Nepal and then in Darjeeling, the prolific Hodgson contributed to the metropolitan scientific scene with ethnological studies encompassing studies of local tribes and languages, based on acute first-hand observation, as well as with articles containing abstract

---

<sup>1</sup> All other sources give the name James *Richardson* Logan.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawfurd 1852a*, vol.I, p.viii; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> *Crawfurd 1856*, p.41.

<sup>4</sup> These almost uniformly referred to directly observable geographical or ethnological phenomena; Logan’s value thus primarily derived from his function as a first-hand observer (or close-by collector) of these phenomena, and as an acute and informed gentleman upon whose word one could rely. For such references by Crawfurd, see e.g. *Crawfurd 1856*, pp.3 (“his excellent account”), 41, 43 (“in the elaborate and judicious sketch which he has given”), 49, 144, 158, 192, 200, 254, 258 (“Mr. Logan, however whose opinion on such a subject is entitled to great respect”), 273, 289 (“by far the best account has been given by Mr. Logan”), 318, 365, 399 (“the following judicious remarks are made by Mr. Logan”), and 436.

<sup>5</sup> *Logan 1847*, p.178. In “Introductory Remark to a Series of Contributions to the Ethnology of the Indian Archipelago”, pp.171-182.

theorizing based the most recent philological researches in Great Britain and Germany.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, Logan often referred to Hodgson's studies in his articles on the (Turanian) connections between the peoples inhabiting the Himalayas and those who occupied the Indo-Pacific realm.<sup>2</sup> In this context Logan stressed the quality of the results obtained by this locally situated ethnologist when compared to what even the foremost metropolitan orientalist, such as Chr. Lassen, had achieved.<sup>3</sup> By discursively equating his own position and project with Hodgson's recognized ethnological research, Logan thus, by association, intended to partake in his position of authority.

Although primarily focussed on linguistic phenomena, Logan did ascribe the notion of race an important function in his grand ethnological survey. In an article on the "Preliminary Remarks on the Generation, Growth, Structure and Analysis of Languages" from 1849, Logan tried to delineate his scope of research and to define his analytical tools; in a footnote running over several, densely written pages, Logan clarified that "ethnology only attends to philology so far as it is connected with and serve to unlock [1] the *general history of man*, physically and intellectually, and [2] the *particular history of races*."<sup>4</sup> Thence it should encompass both the universal aspect, in particular as it was cultivated in the traditional approach of conjectural history, and the modern theme of race with its emphasis on essential differences between different groups of men – notwithstanding the ascribed magnitude of these groups, or whether these were primarily defined in terms of language or biology. Focussing on the latter dimension, Logan stated that "the end which philology as applied to ethnology proposes" is that "when thoroughly analysed, the *general mental progress of the race* will be clearly described."<sup>5</sup> Both as an end and as a means the concept of race assumed an overwhelming importance. Then, without committing himself finally to any fixed biological notion of race, Logan continued with ascribing 1) a definitive primacy to the concept of race within the ethnological investigations of man and 2) a determining influence in the relations of man – both in

---

<sup>1</sup> On these aspects of Hodgson's textual production, its contexts and its receptions, see *Gaenszle and Driem*.

<sup>2</sup> As, for instance, in JIA, vol.III (1849), pp.206-207 (where he compared his own approach to Hodgson's, and offered some improvements to the latter's philological methods); in vol.IV (1850), pp.341 ("I make any remarks on northern Indian ethnology with much diffidence, because it is at present in the hands of Mr. Hodgson, who had admirable qualifications and opportunities for prosecuting it with success") & p.344 ("I think therefore that until Mr. Hodgson settles the point..."); Vol.IX (1855), pp.18, 44, 188, 383-387, 394, 398, 400-401, 407, 422, 434, & Appendix p.42; New Series Vol.III (1859), pp.67-74 & 162-165.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the clearest example hereof is in JIA, Vol.VII (1853), p.21: "They induce a conviction that in India history must be the slight and imperfect superstructure and ethnology the solid basis. Hodgson, I suspect, will do more in the work of clearing away rubbish and restoring the lost annals of the Ganges, than Lassen with all his erudition and genius for historical research." This part is also quoted in *Hunter*, p.295; and it is commented upon in *Pels 1999*, p.98: The Indian history that relied on texts and their interpretation by Oriental(ist) scholars had been contextualized by the biological racism of ethnology." Whereas I by and large concur with this assertion, I will, nonetheless, argue that this ethnological racism was just as much philologically as biologically based; indeed, as I have tried to demonstrate here, the elements of language and biology were at the same time intertwined, opposed, and often even conflated.

<sup>4</sup> *Logan*, p.637; my italics. This article ran from pp.637-677.

<sup>5</sup> *Logan*, p.639; my italics.



terms of affiliation and of agency. It was primarily through race that Man belonged to any kind of society, and race, furthermore, determined his actions.

To Logan, race thus seemed to be virtually everything, and only when this became recognized could ethnology prosper as a true science; only then could it be applied as a scientifically sanctioned guide that set out the principles of good (colonial) governance! Logan thus wrote:

“The foundation of the philosophy of ethnology is a true conception of man, not as he is at present, not even as he exists individually, although that knowledge must be presupposed, but as a Race. *The idea of Race, and of all individuals and generations being subordinated to it*, living not for themselves only or so much, but for the ends of the Race, has not yet grown to its full dimensions, and indeed is only dawning on the most civilized nations.... *We must learn to view the individual in relation to the Race before we can understand his nature, his history, and the full purpose of his existence.* Nothing tends so powerfully to bring out the idea of Race, subordinate the individual to it, and make him see in his own life but a part of a great whole, as an earnest and scientific study of language.”<sup>1</sup>

As a result, Logan’s coupling of race and language implied just as fixed and innate a concept and as unbridgeable a gap between the different races, as if it had been defined explicitly in terms of biology. Whether phonological or biological race – the outcome remained the same: race constituted the fundamental ethnological unit, and it seemed to imply an ineluctable human condition of belonging. It thus facilitated a truly scientific study of man which would not have to take account of any interruptive interference of unfettered individuality, and hence it simultaneously entailed a subordination of human agency to the constraining factors of racial essences. Race, in other words, appeared to be to man what species was to the beast – it ingrained the range of the behaviour of any individual and prescribed it with what seemed to be a scientific certainty. As such, Logan’s theorizing, conducted in the colonial periphery, closely resembled the trend towards a philological racialization as was evinced in the better known writings of such metropolitan savants as Max Müller and especially E. Renan.<sup>2</sup>

In sharp contrast to this insistence on racial matters and its inherently divisive tendency stood Logan’s own global scope of analysis and the search for the kinds of linkages that seemingly connected the different languages spoken by various races all over the world. This striking dissonance between analytical means and theoretical ends seemed to be rather indicative of the ethnology of the day; we meet this in Crawford’s discourses as well, where he time and again would

---

<sup>1</sup> *Logan 1849*, p.640. My italics, but the spelling of Race with a capital ‘R’ is Logan’s own.

<sup>2</sup> Max Müller’s and Renan’s entwined notions of phonological and biological race are discussed in e.g. *Olender*, pp.51-92 (esp. pp.57-63), and *Benes 2008*, pp.211-228.

change his approach, analytical methods, and/or assessments to make them fit into the scientific agenda at stake.

Crawfurd's approaches to these themes (and especially to racial matters) were, as I have endeavoured to demonstrate throughout this dissertation, what we today would label multidisciplinary, and which in D.N. Livingstone's words included "a variety of perspectives ranging from physical anthropology to philology",<sup>1</sup> as well as involving an array of geographical considerations too.<sup>2</sup> Yet such a multidisciplinary approach could easily degenerate into an opportunistic ad hoc exploitation of the approach and the analytical tools that served one's political agenda or ideological ends the best. As rightly stressed by T. Ellingson, an "oscillation between apparently contradictory viewpoints continued throughout Crawfurd's career";<sup>3</sup> however, it was not until the 1850s, and especially during the 1860s, that this became the overwhelming factor in the political manoeuvres through which he, in the odd companionship with J. Hunt, struggled to achieve an institutional leadership within the British field of anthropology. During these two decades this field became more politicised than ever, and the issues of race and the origin of man formed crucial nodal points in the major cultural debates of the time.

Summing up the characteristics of Crawfurd's discourses and their reception during the 1850s, the most conspicuous aspect seemed to be the relative absence of the concept of civilization. This was at least the case in the manners in which Crawfurd's texts were consumed and subsequently discussed, if not in Crawfurd's own discourses per se. As discussed in the preceding Part, civilization continued to constitute a decisive element in Crawfurd's theory on language formation and dissemination, and it played a crucial part in many of the major articles within his "Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries". Although interest in civilization never disappeared altogether from these ethnological discourses, it did definitely recede into the background; this left an impression of race having superseded civilization, both as the most important theoretical theme and, perhaps especially, as the foremost analytical unit. The 1860s only confirmed this tendency as it will be sketched briefly in the following.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Livingstone 1992b*, pp.28-29, and *Livingstone 2008*, p.113.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, *Livingstone 1991*, esp. pp.415-48, and *Livingstone 1992a*, pp.221-222.

<sup>3</sup> *Ellingson*, p.266.

## 4. The Marginalised Malay? Crawford's 1860s Discourses.

The last 10 years of Crawford's life also proved to be the most productive – at least in terms of the number of published texts. They were all originally papers read at either the yearly BAAS conventions, at the meetings at the Ethnological Society of London, or at both places. Indeed his production proved to be so prolific that he was by far the most frequent contributor to the Transactions of the Ethnological Society, and generally this staggering production seemed only to have been equated by that of his collaborator and later opponent, J. Hunt.<sup>1</sup>

### 4.1 Crawford's Career in the Ethnological Society.

The quantity in the production was coupled with an equal versatility; Crawford thus seemed to have been embroiled in most of the important anthropological debates of this turbulent period. Although his name for long has been nearly absent from the historiography of most of these disciplines,<sup>2</sup> it has recently begun to re-enter the literature on the culture of science and its wider contexts during the mid-Victorian Age.<sup>3</sup> In this literature there is, however, ample evidence of his complicity, and at times even of his central position, in these affairs. It was thus, for instance, Crawford who wrote one of the first serious reviews of Darwin's "Origin of Species" in 1859, and throughout the 1860s he continued to be one of the most insistent critics of evolutionism; he did so from the position of scientific polygenism and based on a fixist notion of race.<sup>4</sup> His philological and racial objections to Max Müller's Aryan hypothesis, and in particular to the ideological implications of the assumed Anglo-Indian consanguinity, have already been discussed.<sup>5</sup> His ideas on ethno-climatology and its influence on race and civilization has been examined by D.N. Livingstone over the last two decades or so.<sup>6</sup> His numerous articles with explicitly racial themes have often been

---

<sup>1</sup> In total Crawford published 44 articles in the TES (apart from the 2 published in JES in 1848 and 1850), by far the largest number by anyone during this period, and an amount only approximately equalled, perhaps, by that of J. Hunt in his own Anthropological Review and Journal or the Anthropological Society, or by L. Burke's scribbling in his privately published Journal of Ethnology. (Ellingson, p.305) Ellingson gives the number 38, but I have counted six more; Ellingson probably left out the six articles that were read before but only published posthumously in volume 7 in 1869! Muchison also mentioned 38 in his obituary, but this was written in 1868, and hence it could not have included those articles published in 1869.

<sup>2</sup> Which for long was guided by an inveterate presentist tendency in Stocking's sense of the term. (See esp. *Stocking* 1982, pp.1-12)

<sup>3</sup> The role of Crawford and the content of his textual production during this period are thus discussed at some length in e.g. the following books Adas, *Stafford*, *Livingstone* 1992a, *Riper*, *Beer*, *Trautmann* 1997/2004, *Ellingson*, *Amigoni*, and *Livingstone* 2008, apart from in many articles.

<sup>4</sup> Ellingson appears to be one who has analysed Crawford's complicity in the debates on evolution throughout the 1860s most at depth. (in *Ellingson*, ch.19, pp.316-323) See also *Kenny*, p.378.

<sup>5</sup> This theme seems to be one of the recurring ones in the present day historiography on Crawford, but, as far as I am aware, it was first discussed by G. Beer (*Beer*, esp. pp.8-83) and later discussed most at length by T.R. Trautmann. (In *Trautmann* 1997/2004, pp.172-181, esp. pp.180-181)

<sup>6</sup> As, for instance, in *Livingstone* 1991, *Livingstone* 1992a, and *Livingstone* 2010. Crawford's role in the framing and implementation of the trope of tropicality in India and the Indian Archipelago has also been discussed in the preceding chapters. (See *Arnold* 2005, pp.144-145) Di Gregorio mentioned how the Vienna based naturalist and anthropologist

emphasized as emblematic of the shift from an insidious to the flagrant racism ingrained in the new rigidified racialist paradigm – and to which the spirited reply from D. Naoriji is sometimes emphasized as providing an all too rare counter-discourse.<sup>1</sup> This diverse complicity helped to earn Crawford such epithets as the “objector-general” and the “father of forty Adams”,<sup>2</sup> and, despite the staunch secularist materialism that he had earlier expounded, Darwin would even in a private letter jokingly state that “you [i.e. Crawford] are growing so orthodox, that you will end your days, I believe, in believing in the Tower of Babel.”<sup>3</sup>

All these themes were associated with the intertwined issues regarding the origin(s) of man and – language(s). This universal framework implied a global scope, and this seemed to have occasioned a discursive shift in Crawford’s textual production. First, the scope within his own ethnological studies changed from the primarily being concerned with the Indian Archipelago towards attaining a manifestly global dimension; with this came an even more explicit focus towards the impact of the universal forces at play. Second, this change *within* Crawford’s own discourse seemed to be in concordance with a general shift in interest: the publication of Darwin’s “The Origin of the Species” can thus be perceived as both being the result of- and causing an intensified interest in the questions on the origin of man, the relations between the various societies and races inhabiting globe, and the relation between mankind and nature.<sup>4</sup> As well Crawford’s own writings as the receptions of these had helped during the 1850s to pave the way for this process; Crawford would throughout the 1860s continue to contribute significantly to it, even though he more often than not would side with those who, in the Whig interpretation of history, were later posited on the losing side and consequently condemned to semi-oblivion.

A consequence of this shift in scope, if not necessarily in approach or in theme, was Crawford’s change from the Orientalist orientation towards (Southeast) Asia and the emphasis on language

---

Friedrich Müller (not to be confused with F. Max Müller) referred to Crawford as the authority in matters regarding the effects of climate on human evolution and the development of civilization. (*Gregorio*, p.99)

<sup>1</sup> The latest example of this can be found in *Koditschek 2011*, p.263 where the author lauds how “Naoroji ripped Crawford’s tendentious confection into shreds.” (See also pp.293-297 for more on Naoroji)

<sup>2</sup> There are several references in the JRGS to how its president (Murchison) amiably called him “the objector-general”. (See e.g. JRGS, Vol.III, (1859), pp.91 & 157) Max Müller would also refer to him with that nickname in a letter written to Dr. Pusey on June 2, 1860 (Reproduced in *Max Müller 1902*, Vol.I, pp.237-238), and F. Galton would in his memoirs look back with glee and remember how Murchison “called him laughingly, in public, the Objector General.” (*Galton 1908*, p.173) The phrase “the inventor of forty Adams” is from Sir John Bowring’s *Autobiographical Recollections*; he was known as such in the clubs, “a title he had obtained for reduplicating the doctrine that the various races of mankind are descended from one single ancestor.” (*Bowring*, p.214)

<sup>3</sup> In a letter from Darwin to Crawford, dated April 7, 1861. (Reproduced in the Darwin Correspondence Project”, Letter 3114; can be accessed on: <http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/entry-3114>)

<sup>4</sup> Apart from his review of the “Origin of Species” in the *Examiner* (*Crawford 1859b*) and another late attempt at refuting it in 1868 (*Crawford 1869b*), Crawford would also engage in struggle with both Huxley and Lyell in the context of their publications on the origin and antiquity of mankind. (See *Crawford 1863d*, *Crawford 1865b*, and *Crawford 1868d*. both Lyell and Huxley did also discuss Crawford’s interpretations and opinions in *Lyell 1863*, pp.455-456, and in *Huxley 1899*, pp.214-216. The latter was originally an essay published in the *Fortnightly Review* in 1865 under the title “On the Methods and Results of Ethnology”, *Huxley 1899*, pp.210-253)

towards a global scope and a relative prioritization of race. Throughout the 1860s Crawford only published two articles specifically dealing with Southeast Asia and the Pacific, viz. “On the Malayan Race of Man and Its Prehistoric Career”, and “The Polynesian or Maori Race of Man and Its Prehistoric Career”.<sup>1</sup> To these the short article “On an Ancient Sacrificial Bell, with Inscription found in the Northern Island of the New Zealand Group” from 1867 should be added.<sup>2</sup>

This did not mean, however, that the questions regarding the Malay homeland and the ethnology of Madagascar, which have constituted the recurrent theme in this fourth Part, disappeared totally from Crawford’s discourse. On the contrary they continued to form an important topic in Crawford’s texts. Crawford’s frequent references to this region within his more globally orientated discourses seemed to result from the fact that he was considered an expert on this field, and hence many of his examples would naturally come from this region; but it was also because the region was considered particularly interesting in terms of anthropology due to its combination of racial diversity and the pervasive elements of philological unity – as such it provided a concentrated field, containing all the complexities, patterns, and dynamics which apparently had been at play in the peopling of the entire world and the general evolution of society.<sup>3</sup> If “in the beginning all the world was America” to Locke,<sup>4</sup> and Robertson found that the “History of America” could only be encompassed in a non-narrative and stadial philosophical history,<sup>5</sup> then these approaches had been relocated to the Pacific realm ever since the great voyages of Bougainville, Cook, and their successors. As discussed at length in the first chapter of Part II, this had resulted in the construction of the space of the Indian Archipelago – tugged in between the Pacific and Asia, and where the structural framework of conjectural history clashed with the narratives generated by the textual philology of Orientalism in an epistemic struggle for the interpretive hegemony over the region.

Throughout his whole career Crawford mastered both of these disciplines, yet he had always evinced an unmistakable predilection for the approach grounded in conjectural history. By the

---

<sup>1</sup> Both were published privately in 1868, and the former was also posthumously included in TES in 1869.

<sup>2</sup> That is, *Crawford 1869a*, *Crawford 1868c*, and *Crawford 1867b*.

<sup>3</sup> Crawford would thus refer to Malayan topics in, for instance: *Crawford 1861d*, pp.76-78 & 81-85; *Crawford 1861a*, pp.168-171 & 173-175; *Crawford 1861b*, pp.274-277 & 280-285; *Crawford 1863a*, pp.7-8; *Crawford 1863b*, pp.94-101 & 105-108; *Crawford 1863c*, p.173; *Crawford 1863f*, pp.20-204; *Crawford 1863g*, innumerable references – e.g. pp.456-459; *Crawford 1865a*, pp.4-5 & 8; *Crawford 1865d*, pp.114-117 & 121; *Crawford 1865c*, pp.339-345; *Crawford 1866b*, p.91; *Crawford 1866c*, pp.231-238; *Crawford 1867d*, pp.59, 63, & 81; *Crawford 1867a*; *Crawford 1867b*; *Crawford 1867e*, p.161; *Crawford 1868a*, pp.49.52, & 56; *Crawford 1868b*, pp.64-66, & 69; *Crawford 1868f*, p.119; *Crawford 1868e*, pp.130 & 132; *Crawford 1868g*, pp.188-190, 198, & 204; *Crawford 1868d*, pp.236 & 238; *Crawford 1868h*, pp.145 & 148; *Crawford 1868c*; and *Crawford 1869a*.

<sup>4</sup> An often quoted phrase from Locke’s “Two Treatises on Government”. It was thus used as the title of chapter 2 in *Meek*, pp.37-67; and it was reproduced in, for instance, *Thom*, p.2; *Trigger*, p.116; *Pocock 1999*, p.333; and *Pocock 2005*, p.195.

<sup>5</sup> As discussed in *Pocock 2005*, chapter 10, pp.181-191. See *Carroll 2004* for a comparison between Robertson’s and Marsden’s work on America and Sumatra respectively.

1860s race had superseded language, and it had become the primary analytical unit<sup>1</sup> in this approach which had now been firmly institutionalised into ethnology and anthropology.<sup>2</sup>

The titles of the two articles specifically dedicated to the study of the Malay and Polynesian peoples reflected this shift. When compared with his large article on the same topics from 1848, the term “languages” had disappeared even though the content of the articles revealed that it still constituted a not altogether insignificant topic in Crawford’s research. Its function had, however, undergone some minor changes: by now it was claimed to be purely instrumental,<sup>3</sup> and its value derived primarily from adducing evidence that could be used in discerning the earliest history regarding the origins and disseminations of these peoples as well as the elements and forms of their civilization. However, language was not invoked in defining and demarcating the ethnic entities which were scrutinized by Crawford; these ethnic entities were by now much more unequivocally composed by biologically defined races.<sup>4</sup> Even though biological race had also before acted as an apt analytical unit, reflecting an assumed genuine ethnic entity, the meaning attributed to- and the importance vested in this entity differed markedly; its explanative potential had by now assumed a much more prominent place within Crawford’s ethnological discourse, as it was in particular demonstrated in three of the most important articles that Crawford published in this decade.<sup>5</sup> T. Ellingson has discussed at length the crucial role in the ‘Crawford-Hunt takeover’ of the Ethnological Society played by the reading and publication of the articles “On the Effects of Commixture, Locality, Climate, and Food on the Races of Man” and “On the Conditions Which Favour, Retard, or Obstruct the Early Civilization of Man”, both published in 1861 but read in 1858 and 1859 respectively;<sup>6</sup> whereas D.N. Livingstone has also analysed the intellectual and institutional contexts of “On the Connexion between Ethnology and Physical Geography”.<sup>7</sup>

## **4.2 From Philology to Prehistory? Ethnologizing the Malayan Past.**

Instead of language, the term *prehistory* had now entered in the title of Crawford’s two articles on the Malays and Polynesians. Whereas the notion of prehistory, in a certain sense, had been

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Crawford continued to stress that language still provided the best source of evidence. See, among innumerable examples, *Crawford 1865c*, p.347.

<sup>2</sup> During these years the latter referred to an even more physiologically orientated field of research guided by staunch racist agendas. See e.g. *Stocking 1971* and *Rainiger*.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1868c*, p.16, and *Crawford 1869a*, p.133.

<sup>4</sup> In the Polynesian setting, Crawford thus explicitly spoke of how “one peculiar race of man, speaking the same language”, before he went on to describe “the distinctive characteristics of the race” as an ethnological demarcation of his field of research (*Crawford 1868c*, p.3; the description is on pp.3-6). In the other article, he also began with a description of “the physical form of the Malayan race of man” in order to delineate the scope of the article. (*Crawford 1869a*, pp.119-120)

<sup>5</sup> That is, *Crawford 1861a*, *Crawford 1861d*, and *Crawford 1863a*.

<sup>6</sup> See *Ellingson*, pp.271-302. The first had originally been read at the BAAS meeting in 1858, and, together with the other, these were the two first papers given by Crawford at the Ethnological Society in Winter and Spring 1859.

<sup>7</sup> Especially but not exclusively in *Livingstone 1991* and *Livingstone 1992a*.

present all along in Crawford's discourses, the use of the term in its modern sense, when imbued with a distinct scientific meaning, was not introduced into English until D. Wilson (1816-1892) published his "The Archaeology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland" in 1851.<sup>1</sup> Depending upon the concept of the 3-age system conceived by the Dane C.J. Thomsen (1788-1865)<sup>2</sup> and wherein the earliest times were constituted of subsequent stone-, bronze-, and iron ages, this notion of prehistory had been popularised by J.J.A Worsaae (1821-1885) who travelled extensively on the British Isles.<sup>3</sup> However, it seems to have been through the Norwegian historian P.A. Munch that Wilson appropriated and introduced the term to a British public.<sup>4</sup>

Yet, both a looser concept of prehistory and the term itself had been applied in the study of the Southeast Asian past before then. Writing in 1850 on "The Ethnology of the Indian Archipelago"<sup>5</sup>, Logan thus used the term and provided a definition of it:

"At the remotest period to which *authentic history* can anywhere reach, the same phenomena meet us, so that we have, 1<sup>st</sup> a *historic*, and 2<sup>nd</sup> a *prehistoric*, or *archaic* era. If we include in the historic time all that is authentically recorded, graphically or traditionally, and in the archaic [or *prehistoric*] all that can be positively proved by the evidence of customs, arts, &c., we must recognize a more remote or *primordial period*, anterior to the development of the civilisation in which these customs arose, but to which we can give a certain embodiment by the evidence of language. Of the duration of even the archaic [prehistoric] era ethnology can tell us nothing positive. It tells us however that it must have been great, and, we should naturally be lead to conclude, far greater than that of the historic period, because at the dawning of the latter, we find every considerable nation of the higher historic antiquity had already assumed a fixed location and form."<sup>6</sup>

So, in Logan's discourse the prehistoric era did not refer to the oldest of times, but merely to the period that preceded historical time. Before this came the *primordial period*. Together the prehistoric and the primordial periods seemed to form "two great *ethnic eras*"<sup>7</sup> that temporally appeared to correspond more or less with Wilson's notion of prehistory; but, like Crawford and most others in the British realm at this time, Logan remained encapsulated in a paradigm where language held the uncontested methodological primacy as the main provider of evidence and as the marker of the periods. Without the tangible materiality provided by the 3-age system, the concept of

<sup>1</sup> Kelley, p.22, and Rowly-Conwy, p.154.

<sup>2</sup> Thomsen's idea of the three-age system, the context and their networks of exchange in which it was conceptualized is dealt with in Rowly-Conwy, pp.37-47.

<sup>3</sup> See Rowly-Conwy, esp. pp.13-19, 66—81, 108-11, 146-152, 194-204, and Trigger, pp.121-138

<sup>4</sup> Rowly-Conwy, pp.157-159 & Kelley, p.27.

<sup>5</sup> Its full title was: "The Ethnology of the Indian Archipelago: Embracing Enquiries into the Continental Relations of the Indo-Pacific Islanders", JIA, Vol.IV (1850), pp.252-347.

<sup>6</sup> Logan 1850, p.286; my italics.

<sup>7</sup> Logan 1850, p.286.

prehistory would remain either a kind of antiquarianism, ethnology, or it would continue to be guided by the tenets of conjectural history.<sup>1</sup> Outside Europe and the realms of the great civilizations (like Egypt, the Orient, India, and, to a certain degree, China), the situation actually remained like that for the greater part of the 19<sup>th</sup> C.; the material artefacts that could be encountered here failed to excite in the same degree of excitement as it did within the framework of the European burgeoning nation-state, or at the sites of the ancient civilizations. As a result, the colonial archaeology of the primitive saw a much closer and much more durable fusion between archaeology and anthropology than ever happened in Europe.<sup>2</sup>

In his excellent study on the shift of interpretive frameworks and methodological approaches, “From Genesis to Prehistory”, D. Rowly-Conwy has examined the receptions and implementations of this new concept of *prehistory* within the different British intellectual environments of Scotland, Ireland, and England. Here they clashed and coalesced with the locally reigning paradigms of a 4-stage conjectural history, a text-based ancient history, and a Prichardian ethnology with its shallow notion of time.<sup>3</sup> In the English context, the notion of prehistory was during the 1860s gradually integrated into the archaeological and ethnological vocabularies, and it came to form one of the contested nodal points around which the scientific and cultural debates revolved. Many of these debates occurred within the institutional framework of the ethnological society, and the titles of books like Daniel Wilson’s own “Prehistoric Man. Researches into the History of Civilization in the Old and New World” (1862)<sup>4</sup> and Sir John Lubbock’s (1834-1913) “Prehistoric Times, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the manners and Customs of Modern Savages” (1865)<sup>5</sup> reflected the theoretical importance vested in the concept of prehistory within archaeology as well as ethnology.<sup>6</sup>

Discussing the possibility of prehistoric maritime voyaging, D. Wilson referred to Crawford’s hypothesis regarding the haphazard mode in which Malay language and civilization had reached Madagascar; he emphasized that it was as a result of accidental encounters by tempest-driven

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kelley, esp. pp.24-27.

<sup>2</sup> Diaz-Andreu, pp.278-313; this assertion is taken from p.310.

<sup>3</sup> This was one of the main points in Rowly-Conwy, and it was argued at length in chapters 4-6 (pp.82-234)

<sup>4</sup> Wilson wrote this book whilst lecturing at the University of Toronto. (Trigger, p.,178; Rowly-Conwy, p.171)

<sup>5</sup> Lubbock was one of the members of the informal X-Club together with, amongst others, Huxley, Darwin, and J.D. Hooker who all championed the theory of evolution. (Gondermann) Lubbock was, however, most renowned as an ethnologist, and, judging from TES, he and Crawford seemed to alternate on the positions as President and Vice-President throughout the 1860s. On Lubbock’s textual production and ethnological thought, see e.g. Stocking 1987, pp.150-156; Trigger, pp.171-176; Koditschek 2010, pp.39-44; and Koditschek 2011, pp.210-220.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford would himself address the question of the relevancy and applicability of the 3-age system in a global context in his article on “On the Supposed Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages of Society “. (Crawford 1866a) Although he later invoked elements from the 3-age system in his article on Polynesia, Crawford was rather dismissive of its scope and applicability in this article – both from theoretical arguments (p.2; see also Rowly-Conwy, p.258), but especially on heuristic grounds; iron seemed to be much more perishable than bronze, and hence it was less likely to be encountered in archaeological excavations, even though its use may have been extensive (see e.g. p.12)



prahus, rather than being the outcome of premeditated, well organized expeditions.<sup>1</sup> Ironically, however, Wilson adduced this as evidence in support of his diffusionist hypothesis; he actually directed against those “modern scientific theorists” who, like Crawford during the 1860s, thought it “an easier thing to create a score of red, brown, and black Adams and Eves, wherewith to increase multiply, and replenish each “realm,” or province of the animal world, than to believe that man was transferred to new regions, and affected by their physical influences, just like we see the horse, ox, and hog have been in our own day.”<sup>2</sup> Crawford would then later set out to refute the kind of interpretation advanced here by Wilson in his article “On the Early Migrations of Man” published in 1865.<sup>3</sup> Echoing Wilson’s rhetoric, but inverting its argument, Crawford here stated that: “some writers, in their determination to maintain the hypothesis of the unity of man and the derivation of the many races which now exist from a single family and a single spot of the earth’s surface, have imagined distant migrations which it is physically impossible could ever have taken place.”<sup>4</sup> Indeed, Crawford contended, in the vitriolic and polemic rhetoric that became his trademark from around 1860 and onwards,<sup>5</sup> that “the theory on which such migrations are founded is not ethnology at all, but philology run mad, and usurping the places of ethnology, of geography, and of history.”<sup>6</sup> In concordance with the polygenetic paradigm Crawford maintained that: “in his rudest and earliest condition man is, by necessity, home-keeping, divided into small and usually hostile tribes, speaking different languages, occupying confined localities of which the narrow limits are hunting and fishing grounds”,<sup>7</sup> before he continued with his diatribes against Max Müller’s Aryan idea<sup>8</sup> and in particular against the late Prichard’s notion of a Malayo-Polynesian language family, race, and civilization.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Wilson 1862*, Vol.I, pp.150-151.

<sup>2</sup> *Wilson 1862*, Vol.I, p.150. The latter part refers to Prichard’s theory of gradual change over time in human physiognomy, so that the present racial diversity could be explained within the theoretical confines of monogeny; in his argumentation, Prichard relied heavily on an analogical reasoning, where he referred to the transmutations in domesticated animals when compared to their wild ‘counterparts’. (*Prichard 1848*, pp.26-75. Discussed in *Rowly-Conwy*, pp.89-92)

<sup>3</sup> The paper was read on April 12<sup>th</sup>, 1864.

<sup>4</sup> *Crawford 1865c*, p.335.

<sup>5</sup> This quite conspicuous change in rhetorical strategy has been discussed in *Ellingson*, pp.291-292. Ellingson saw this “as part of the general process of Barnumization that transformed British showmanship during the period”; for Crawford this implied “abandoning the restrained, serious style of his earlier lectures in favour of a Barnumesque foregrounding of blunt language, vivid imagery, humour, and an appeal to the ladies”. Murchison, on the other hand, described it as “his genial address and his happy and simple manner of conveying information”, and he referred to the obituary in the *Times* which claimed that Crawford was renowned for his “forbearance and courtesy which might well be imitated by all members of learned Societies.” (*Murchison*, p.clii)

<sup>6</sup> *Crawford 1865c*, p.350.

<sup>7</sup> *Crawford 1865c*, p.335.

<sup>8</sup> *Crawford 1865c*, pp.346-349; here Crawford by and large reiterated the same arguments as those forwarded in his article from 1861 on the Aryan or Indo-Germanic theory.

### 4.3 Resurrecting Prichard: Crawford's Rhetorical Archenemy.

In this article ("On the Early Migrations of Man") Crawford began his critique of Prichard even before he had commenced his analysis of Prichard's theory and hypothesis; through his dismissive rhetoric Crawford thus from the very onset rejected that Prichard's interpretation offered a serious alternative. "The late learned and zealous Dr. Prichard was deeply imbued with *such crude fantasies*"<sup>1</sup> – such as those which supposed a monogenetic origin of man which was then followed by a genealogical diffusion in the earliest of times.

In the context of the Indian Archipelago and the Pacific it was in particular Prichard's displacement narrative which Crawford assailed,<sup>2</sup> and, after quoting Prichard at length, he concluded that: "It would not be easy to compress a greater mass of ethnological error in a smaller bulk than is to be found in these passages in which hard words are substituted for knowledge."<sup>3</sup> Crawford's remained unaltered. 1) An apparent absence of racial and linguistic connections with outer world led him to conclude that "there exists in no part of the world, far or near, a Malayan race out of the region in which we now find it, and consequently there is no country from which the Malays could have emigrated"<sup>4</sup> – hence the Malayan race had to be autochthonous to this region. 2) The very notion of the existence of one single brown-complexioned race, characterized by its racial and linguistic coherence, was impugned too: "Then, we have the *invented name of a Malayo-Polynesian race*, although no such race exists. The term is, in fact, founded on the supposition that the Malays and the fair natives of the islands of the Pacific are essentially the same race, although the latter be taller than the former by at least a quarter of a foot, and although the languages differ not only in structure but even in words, a very small number of Malayan terms excepted, introduced into the language of the fairer race, but found equally in the language of the Negro races."<sup>5</sup>

What had changed, however, was that rhetoric through which these differences were uttered: eloquence had replaced hard evidence as the means of argumentation, and although Crawford at times cursorily referred to both racial and linguistic evidence, these were clearly not vested with the same discursive importance as before. Polemics held the sway over argumentation within this densely politicised cultural environment, and the communicative situation seemed to be more attuned towards converting than convincing. This unbalanced and acerbic critique of Prichard thus

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1865c, p.343; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> "The object of the writer [i.e. Prichard] is to prove that the black or Negro people are the aborigines of the countries in question, and the fairer race strangers and intruders." (Crawford 1865c, p.343)

<sup>3</sup> Crawford 1865c, p.343.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1865c, p.344.

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1865c, p.344; my italics. Crawford would even by now, on philological evidence, contest the validity of the notion of a single Malayan race inhabiting the Indian Archipelago: "on the contrary, speaking as they do many different and distinct languages, the great probability is that they never were united." (Crawford 1865c, p.344)

seemed to be emblematic of Crawford's polemical discourse and political agenda throughout the 1860s, given that similar examples can be encountered in many other articles.<sup>1</sup>

However, it was not until the 1860s that Prichard became Crawford's rhetorical archenemy. Prichard was not mentioned even once in Crawford's article on "On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races", or in his "Preliminary Dissertation", or in the "Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries", despite the flagrant fact that these were closer to Prichard's writings in both time and thematic scope.

This begs the question why Prichard had to be discursively resurrected and how came to serve as a rhetoric straw man? – As an object of sarcasm, as one whose arguments did not deserve better than being categorically dismissed. Indeed, Crawford contended that it would be "*needless to enter into formal refutation of so idle a dream* as that of imagining some of the finest parts of the world to be uninhabited, until peopled by imaginary migrations at imaginary times."<sup>2</sup> By banishing his opponents' hypotheses and conjectures to the sphere of idle imagination, Crawford simultaneously lifted the burden of explanation from his own explanative mode, viz. that of postulating an autochthonous origin every time that the chain of (apparently) irrefutable evidence came to a halt. If a genealogical diffusion was a priori discarded as pure fiction rather than posing a possible fact, then the theory of independent origins would automatically impose itself as the obvious solution.

In essence Crawford continued to assert the same hypothesis, invoke the same theoretical standpoint, and, with minor emendations<sup>3</sup> and a much more explicit racialized inclination, to inscribe these within the same referential framework. And he continued to argue against the same theories, methodological approaches, and interpretive frameworks that he had assailed throughout his entire philological and ethnological career; first it was directed against Marsden's ideas, then Humboldt's work was added, and now these had been replaced by Max Müller and in particular by Prichard. Yet the most important difference seemed to be the change in tone; the decided, but still respectful disagreement which had reigned in the Crawford's discourses on Marsden and Humboldt<sup>4</sup> had by now been substituted by polemical discord and ridicule.

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. *Crawford 1861b*, pp.275, 277, 279 (all on Celtic, Indo-European, or theoretical issues); *Crawford 1861c*, pp.373-375 & 377-378 (on racial classification and determining criteria); *Crawford 1863e*, p.257 (On the notion of a Black Adam in the 1<sup>st</sup> edition of Prichard's "Researches in the Physical History of Man" from 1813); and *Crawford 1868e*, p.127.

<sup>2</sup> *Crawford 1865c*, pp.349-350; my italics.

<sup>3</sup> Not at least with regard to religious connotations; these were before conspicuously absent, but in the 1860s they appeared every now and then; see e.g. *Crawford 1861c*, p.362 ("but the Creator is supposed to have made man a special exception"), & p.365 ("It has pleased the Creator – for reasons to us inscrutable – to plant certain fair races in the temperate regions of Europe, and there only, and certain black ones in the tropical and sub-tropical regions of Africa and Asia, to the exclusion of the white ones, but it is certain that climate has nothing to do with the matter.")

<sup>4</sup> As late as in 1852 Crawford would contrast W. von Humboldt's analysis of the Philippine languages favourably with the earlier Spanish approaches that represented "the mere assertion of men who had not attended to the subject, or, in a word, who really knew nothing at all about it", and who argued "without showing any evidence for their belief". (*Crawford 1852*, Vol.I, p.cxxviii) And, even though Crawford insisted on the erroneous nature of Humboldt's analysis,

It is difficult to avoid the impression that this change in tone and the choice of Prichard as the rhetorical opponent were direct results of the cultural and political confines constituted by the specific spatio-temporal configurations that characterized science production and circulation in London at this period. The very public spaces of the meetings at the Ethnological Society and in particular at the BAAS conventions seemed at times to be just as much scientific showrooms as places of knowledge production.<sup>1</sup> These were hence sites of cultural confrontation where the natural theologian, the scientific polygenist, and the defender of the theory of evolution met and clashed, just as much as they were venues of science.<sup>2</sup> In this specific context it seemed that Crawford's caustic critique of Prichard was just as much directed against those whom he perceived to be the existing custodians of the Prichardian heritage. Prichard was not only known as the inventor of the term Malayo-Polynesian, reflecting the connection that J.R. Forster had intimated and Marsden later demonstrated, but he was also renowned as the 'founding father' of the philanthropically orientated and philologically based English ethnology with its essential assumptions of monogenesis and subsequent diffusion. Ridiculing and refuting Prichard's theories thus implied an unmasked attempt at undermining the position and authority of the whole Prichardian paradigm too.

#### **4.4 The Wallace-Crawford Divide: A Tale of Authority.**

Besides within the published articles, Crawford would also have found ample opportunity to discuss Malay matters with A.R. Wallace who, after his return in 1862 from the long expedition to the Malay Archipelago, contributed with articles to both the TES and the Journal of the

---

he would still take great pains to exculpate what he primarily perceived as nothing more than an unhappy misinterpretation by an individual who was otherwise a genius. He thus 'excused' Humboldt's hypothesis by (1) tracing the fault in his misappropriation to parts of the source-material which contained flawed data that could easily be interpreted erroneously, and (2) by presenting Humboldt as an accomplished *generalist, synthesiser, and philosopher* (as opposed to *specialist, empiricist, and scientist*) his flaws on the empirical material could be somewhat excused without maligning Humboldt's character, or the general authority vested herein. As he concluded: "I cannot help thinking that this hypothesis, maintained with much ingenuity, must have originated in this eminent scholar's practical unacquaintance with any one language of the many which came under his consideration, and that had he possessed the necessary knowledge, the mere running over the pages of any Philippine dictionary would have satisfied him of the error of his theory." (pp.cxxviii-cxxix)

<sup>1</sup> An important issue then was whether women should be allowed to participate in the meetings of the Ethnological Society. This question was invoked in the struggle between Crawford and the Hunt-led faction of more hard-core biological racialists, and which led to the breakaway and formation of the Anthropological Society in 1863; Crawford preferred a larger integration of women, both because these seemed to be prone to fall under the spell of his not inconsiderable charm (As stressed in *Ellingson*, p.282, and which his contemporaries also felt bound to emphasize – see e.g. *Galton*, p.74, and especially *Murchison*, p.clii: "Let me add that he was equally popular with the gentler sex, who could not fail to be attracted to him by his genial address and his happy and simple manner of conveying information."), and, more importantly, because their presence automatically would exclude any public discussion of the more delicate aspects of comparative anatomy, and hence philology would, by default, gain the upper hand heuristically and methodologically – something which Crawford favoured in this specific context where the opponents were composed of the hardcore racist faction. (*Ellingson*, pp301-302, 306, & 313-314; *Burrow 1966*, pp.120-121; *Vetter 2009*, p.7 for an example of such topics that could not be addressed in the Ethnological Society – viz. phallic worship). For a more comprehensive analysis of this aspect within the venue of the BAAS, from which Crawford drew his inspiration to allowing women in the Ethnological Society, see *Higgitt & Withers*.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of the ideas on- and impact of public and professional spaces of science, in *Lightman*, pp.40-45.

Anthropological Society,<sup>1</sup> as well he participated in their meetings and was present at the BAAS conventions. Wallace went out to the East Indies as a moderately well known collector and a mere collector of naturalia for others<sup>2</sup> whose account of his earlier experiences along the Amazon River and its tributaries had become something of a bestseller.<sup>3</sup> He returned as a significantly more renowned figure whose article “On the Tendency of Varieties to Depart Indefinitely From the Original Type”, with its ideas on natural selection and evolution, had prompted Darwin to finally finish and publish his “Origin of Species” the year after, in 1859. But still he had to struggle to carve out a position of authority for himself within the social space of the learned societies and institutions of knowledge in the metropolis, as J. Vetter recently has pointed out.<sup>4</sup> Or, as C. Ballard expressed it: “the capacity to deliver ‘sound generalizations’ from their own field observations was a trait common to Crawfurd, [G.W.] Earl, and Wallace, but securing recognition for their accounts required that their senses be as keen to the prevailing winds of scientific opinion in London and Europe as they had been to human difference in the Malay Archipelago.”<sup>5</sup> In this quest Wallace became involved in first the newly founded Anthropological Society, before he later, in 1866, joined the Ethnological Society under the presidency of Crawfurd, and where the pro-evolution circle around Lubbock was gaining in influence. The former venue suited his methodological approach and his desire to study man in the context of nature best, but the main members’ conservative convictions, pro-slavery stance, and staunchly anti-evolutionary theories were directly at odds with Wallace’s Owenite (socialist) leanings and ideas on man’s complicity in the process of natural selection; yet neither did he, as a self-made upstart, ever felt at ease amongst the Establishment who made up the most important constituency of the Ethnological Society.<sup>6</sup>

Simultaneously he had since 1854 been a member of the Royal Geographical Society,<sup>7</sup> and after his return to England he also participated and gave papers at the BAAS meetings, two of which were later published in the TES,<sup>8</sup> and where the article “On the Varieties of Man in the Malay Archipelago” has already been discussed in an earlier chapter of this dissertation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Wallace 1864* and *Wallace 1865*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Vetter 2009*, pp.1-2.

<sup>3</sup> See esp. *Raby*, pp.75-123 for Wallace’s travels with first H.W. Bates and later with R. Spruce (pp.87-89 on Wallace’s book “Travels of the Amazon and Rio Negro” published in 1853), and *Stocking 1987*, pp.96-102.

<sup>4</sup> The central theme in *Vetter 2009* was a study of the conditions surrounding and strategies employed in this “significant boundary crossing in science”, from being a mere field collector of artefacts (and facts more generally) into the “more densely saturated landscape of scientific societies and complicated factions” in metropolitan London.

<sup>5</sup> *Douglas & Ballard*, p.178.

<sup>6</sup> See *Vetter 2009*, pp.2-7.

<sup>7</sup> The RGS had already from the onset helped to facilitate Wallace’s voyage to- and around in the Malay Archipelago. (*Stafford*, pp.149-150)

<sup>8</sup> *Wallace 1864*, and *Wallace 1866*. The former was read at the BAAS meeting at Newcastle in 1863 (Mentioned in *Report of the Thirty-third Meeting of the BAAS*, London 1864, pp.147-148), and the latter at the BAAS meeting in Bath in 1864. (Mentioned in *Report of the Thirty-fourth Meeting of the BAAS*, London 1865, pp.149-150)

Wallace would undoubtedly have had a plenty opportunity to associate with Crawfurd in the space provided by these different venues, and this newly arrived connoisseur of the Malay Archipelago would definitely have had a lot to discuss with the weathered doyen of the Indian Archipelago. Indeed, Wallace himself later referred to how he had lent Crawfurd some vocabularies that he had collected during his voyages in the Malay Archipelago.<sup>1</sup> They would also exchange opinions in public during the official sessions at these venues.

One of these exchanges took place at a meeting in the Royal Geographical Society on Jun8, 1863. When Wallace's paper "On the Physical Geography of the Malay Archipelago"<sup>2</sup> had been read by the president, Sir R. Murchison, Crawfurd, after appraising the stock of information contained in Wallace's paper, inquired into what Wallace had to say about the human inhabitants of these regions, given that he "knew more about them than any Englishman, for he had lived among them".<sup>3</sup>

In particular, Crawfurd was interested in how Wallace would inscribe the racial configurations evinced in this region in to his larger geological and biological framework, structured along the notion of a strict demarcation line dividing the region into a zone dominated by a fauna akin to that of Asia, which Crawfurd here referred to as "the Indian portion", and another zone with a fauna resembling the Australian one. Now, asked Crawfurd, "seeing that he [Wallace] conjoined Australia and New Guinea as part of the same region, how it happened that the human inhabitants were totally different?" And "Again, if the Indo-Malayan portion of the islands were grouped with India, how came that no two human groups could be more unlike than the Hindoo and the Malay?"<sup>4</sup> At play here was thus Crawfurd's idea of the existence of a multiplicity of seemingly unconnected, black races in the region, as well as his conviction of the autochthonous origin of the Malay race in this region. Written out of this discourse, however, seemed to be Crawfurd's own, earlier establishment of fundamental *historical* (although not *racial*) links between India and this region,

---

<sup>1</sup> Wallace 1869, p.603. Wallace would then lament how 25 of these vocabularies subsequently had been mislaid while in the possession of Crawfurd during a change of residence. J. Bastin remarked that Wallace actually learned Malay from the combined measures of his servant, Ali, and a copy of Crawfurd's "A Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language", provided to him by his agent in London in 1856 or 1857; he only had the 2<sup>nd</sup> volume (the dictionary) sent out to him, whereas the 1<sup>st</sup> volume, containing the "Preliminary Dissertation" remained in England. (Bastin 1986, pp.xix-xx) And, as Wallace admitted, when he actually employed linguistic evidence in his arguments on the origin and distribution of races in the Malay Archipelago and the Pacific he preferred the "far more the extensive and complete information of Mr. Crawfurd's most valuable and interesting *dissertation on the Affinities of the Malayan Languages*" over W. von Humboldt's hypothesis of the connectedness of all the languages of the region. (Wallace 1865, p.214)

<sup>2</sup> This was later printed in the JRGS, Vol.33 (1863), pp.217-234.

<sup>3</sup> This debate was referred to in Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, Vol.VII, Session 1862-1863, Nos.I-V (London 1863), pp.210-212. This quotation is from p.211.

<sup>4</sup> Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, Vol.VII, p.211. It continued: "How did the Malays come there? How were the dwarfish inhabitants of the Andaman Islands to be accounted for? for there was no such people in India – that was certain. How were the pigmy negroes of the Malay Peninsula to be accounted for? There were differences here which he (Mr. Wallace) might perhaps be able to reconcile."

and which had provided the name he bestowed upon it in his earlier texts – viz. that of the Indian Archipelago! Wallace responded:

“However, he would say, generally, that the races of man do not correspond at all accurately to those two great divisions of the Archipelago, which differed so remarkably in their natural productions. The reason why they did not correspond appeared to him to be simply this; that man is a migratory animal and continually moving about. We had a great deal of historical evidence of the number of changes of the races of man in the Archipelago itself. Some races have been driven out; others have come in; others have made conquests; others have gone to more fertile regions. Therefore, the races of man would not correspond to those of animals and plants. *Still there was a slight general correspondence.* There was a Malay race, the whole of which, generally speaking, corresponded to the western half of the Archipelago... The Papuan race occupied the eastern half, and extended into New Guinea. *It was probable that they had extended still further west, but they had been driven back by the Malayan race.*”<sup>1</sup>

Here Wallace thus anticipated the theme of the paper “On the Varieties of Man in the Malay Archipelago”, as well as he drew the contours of the establishment of a ‘second boundary line’ which he would elaborate on a few months later at the BAAS meeting in Newcastle. In time Wallace would, through the application of a concept of deep ethnological time, be able to harmonize this seemingly polygenetic approach with a framework based on monogenism, and where the dynamic was driven by evolution through natural selection; the vast extension of human (pre)history allowed the existence of the idea of *seemingly* fixed races, each endowed with their specific physiological and intellectual qualities, whilst, at the same time, assuming them all to descend from the same source.<sup>2</sup>

Of a more politically contagious nature was Wallace’s second paper delivered at the BAAS meeting in 1864. Entitled “On the Progress of Civilization in Northern Celebes”, it dealt with the how, on a basis the scientific facts provided by the ethnology or anthropology, the most adequate mode of colonial governance could be devised and implemented, and here Wallace spoke in appraisal of the Dutch Cultivation System, so maligned in British discourses as epitomizing all the maladies pertaining to an earlier age of colonial abuse and reckless plunder. This system seemed to constitute the evil antithesis to the optimistic doctrines of free trade and its jubilant Manchester Creed which had bolstered the reigning ideology of liberal imperialism,<sup>3</sup> and which had governed

---

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, Vol.VII, p.212. See also *Douglas & Ballard*, pp.178-184.

<sup>2</sup> On this, see e.g. *Stocking 1987*, pp.148-149.

<sup>3</sup> The cultural contexts of which were discussed in *Koditschek 2011*; see also the relevant parts of *Pitts 2005* for the more philosophical aspects of the debates revolving around the notion of liberal imperialism during these years.

the colonial, and perhaps especially extra-colonial, practices during the early- and mid-Victorian eras.<sup>1</sup> Most of the members of the Ethnological Society (obviously including Crawfurd) were still staunch defenders of this ideology<sup>2</sup> which fitted well into the paradigm of *naturalized* universal progression which had grown out of the Scottish conjectural history and of the Utilitarian movement.

Recently, the Dutch system had even attacked from the inside; in 1860 Multatuli – a pseudonym for Eduard Douwes Dekker, a former employee a Java – had published the novel “Max Havelaar” in which the Dutch politics on that island were heavily censured. Although it seems not have been translated into English before 1868, Wallace apparently felt himself compelled to comment upon it the following year in his “The Malay Archipelago”. It was “a very tedious and long-winded story”, Wallace found, and “even if not exaggerated, the fact stated are not nearly so bad as those of the oppression by free-trade indigo-planters, and torturing by native tax-gatherers under British rule in India”.<sup>3</sup> This assertion merely represented an extension of the view that he had presented at BAAS five years earlier; Wallace here praised the Dutch “controlleur-system” of surveillance and control on northern Celebes which since 1822 had brought peace and prosperity, where before it had been “a picture of true savage life, of small isolated communities at war with all around them, subject to the wants and miseries of such a condition”.<sup>4</sup> In contrast, “the people are now the most industrious, peaceable, and civilised in the whole Archipelago”, and he asserted that “these results are attributable in a great measure the system of government now adopted by the Dutch in their Eastern possessions. The system is one which may be called a ‘*paternal despotism*’.”<sup>5</sup> It was only the latter part that provoked controversy. As Wallace admitted, “we Englishmen do not like despotism”, and “we are right when we are dealing with men of our own race, and of similar ideas and equal capacities with ourselves.” Yet, Wallace stated, “the case is different when the governed are in an admitted state of inferiority to their rulers”; referring to the well known situation within the school or the family, “even we use a certain amount of despotism and believe it to be necessary, because we now that children and pupils are unable to decide for themselves what will be the best for their permanent welfare.”<sup>6</sup> Of importance here was the attributed nature of this relation. As stressed by Wallace: “Now, there is *not merely an analogy*, – there is in many respects an *identity of relation between master and pupil, or parent and child, on the one hand, and an uncivilised race and its*

---

<sup>1</sup> As originally argued by Gallagher and Robinson in their famous article on “The Imperialism of Free Trade”; see Thompson 2008, pp.43-46 for a recent discussion of the relevancy of- and problems associated with the notion of a “Free Trade Era” as a significant period in British imperial history (c.1815(1830)-c.1860), following after the ‘Military-Fiscal State’ of the Imperial Meridian.

<sup>2</sup> Vetter 2009, p.10.

<sup>3</sup> Wallace 1869, pp.107 & 108.

<sup>4</sup> Wallace 1866, p.63.

<sup>5</sup> Wallace 1866, p.66; my italics.

<sup>6</sup> All these quotes are from Wallace 1866, pp.66-67.



*civilised rulers on the other.*”<sup>1</sup> Claiming to focus on results rather than intention, Wallace concluded that:

“The system which produces such results I believe to be a good one, and I think that we should hesitate in applying the principles of free competition to the relations between ourselves and savage races, if we ever expect them to advance in civilisation or even maintain their existence upon earth.”<sup>2</sup>

The Dutch colonial system, like a stern bonus pater, would thus protect the childish natives from the potentially depraving vices of an untrammelled exposition to the laissez faire system; here the stronger had free hands to have it their way, and they possessed the potential to exert their wicked will upon the weak. Modernization, in other words, was not a natural process but it entailed guidance, it implied control and vigilance if it should not derail and turn into a corrupted version of modern society.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, as intimated above, the grim alternative could easily turn out to be an extinction of these savage races.<sup>4</sup>

It is almost superfluous to add that such a weathered anti-monopolist and proven Paladin of free trade as Crawford would pass his heavy strictures on this view. Despite a growing pessimism – resulting from an ever more rigorously racialized view of mankind, and an accompanying diminished civilizational potential for large parts of it – Crawford did nevertheless in this *specific context* still abide by the universalist precepts ingrained in the liberal-imperialist doctrine. Crawford would here continue to claim that free trade constituted its surest harbinger, and hence it still provided the best instrument of civilization. Crawford intervened in the discussion that followed after Wallace’s paper, and he said that “he had neither expected to have an apology for monopoly nor despotism from Mr. Wallace.”<sup>5</sup> The Dutch system was without doubt exploitative, and furthermore a system “that treated the people as children, but the people were not children; and something better than flogging them to make them work hard had been adopted at Singapore.”<sup>6</sup> Despite agreeing on the existence of a racial hierarchy, Crawford and Wallace evidently held discrepant views regarding the most adequate discourse through which this should be articulated,

---

<sup>1</sup> Wallace 1866, p.67; my italics.

<sup>2</sup> Wallace 1866, p.69.

<sup>3</sup> And which, mutatis mutandis, bore many resemblances to the rationale provided by especially many Scottish Orientalists and Indian scholar-administrators in favour of an *enlightened mode of oriental despotism* as an apt mode of governance in India in the transition from an ancient society, frozen in the grip of its petrified traditions, to a modern society, governed on British (inspired) principles. This despotism was perceived as only transitory and temporary, and seen as a necessary step towards modernization, facilitating the education and upbringing of an Indian cadre capable of governing itself. See especially McLaren 1993, and McLaren 2001. The obvious difference between the two was the prescribed mode of production and the official enforcement of the workforce though.

<sup>4</sup> On these *extinction discourses*, see also Brantlinger 2003, pp.182-188.

<sup>5</sup> This debate at the BAAS after Wallace’s paper was reprinted in The Anthropological Review, Vol.II (London 1864), pp.332-334. This quotation is from p.334.

<sup>6</sup> The Anthropological Review, Vol.II, p.334.

the interpretive framework embedded in this discourse, and its ideological implications as well as its political manifestations.

In the reply to this, Wallace intimated that consensus on the blessings of free trade did not necessarily imply truth, and he succinctly remarked “that with regard to the Maories, Mr. Crawford had [himself] enunciated a doctrine with which he would find but few sympathisers in this room.”<sup>1</sup> Commenting upon Wallace’s claim that the Maories, with groups of whom the British were at this moment, engaged in a deadlocked war, “were capable of improvement and civilization under some system which, treating them for a while as children, should have educated and perfected them”<sup>2</sup>, Crawford remarked they had been treated “on terms of equality”, they had been civilized, and “if they resisted a superior race, they must be taught that they must give way, and he did not care, if they resisted us, what became of them.”<sup>3</sup>

#### **4.5 Crawford’s Last Articles on the Malayan and Polynesian Races.**

And thus we have now returned to the topics dealt with in the two last articles that Crawford wrote on the Malay and Polynesian races of men and their prehistory in the late 1860s. In spite of the disappearance of the term *language* their titles, and despite Crawford’s reorientation in both content and rhetoric from the late 1850s and onwards, what in particular characterised these two articles was a remarkable element of continuity; in most aspects they resembled his earlier studies on these topics. Racial concerns may have determined the definition and the demarcation of the analysed ethnic entities, but language still provided the principal field of investigation and philology purveyed most of the evidence adduced in the articles. And civilization, its development over time and dissemination in space, continued to constitute his main concern, notwithstanding the thoroughly racialized terminology that permeated his discourse.

Not much new was added in these articles – neither in terms of data, its use of evidence, or the interpretation of these. It was thus rather exceptional in this discourse when Crawford invoked the 3-Age System and referred to the Polynesians as living “in fact, in the *stone age* – that era in the history of the progress of civilised nations, the only record of which is like the fossil remains of a previous organic world, to be found in caves and in the drift.”<sup>4</sup> Yet he would not elaborate any further on this approach and its accompanying kinds of evidence; on the contrary, he instead once more took recourse to philology, with its well known and, Crawford seemed to think, already proven methods. There was thus something utterly familiar in both content and form when Crawford claimed that: “as in other parts of the world, the number of languages will be found in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Anthropological Review, Vol.II, p.334.

<sup>2</sup> Wallace 1866, p.69.

<sup>3</sup> The Anthropological Review, Vol.II, p.334.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1868c, p.6; my italics.

inverse proportion to the density of population”<sup>1</sup> and its ensuing level of civilization; or when he asserted that “the words which convey most clearly the extent of the benefits which the two most civilised nations have conferred on the less advanced are those connected with...”,<sup>2</sup> whereupon Crawford commenced enumerating those *civilization indicating terms* that were so characteristic to his discourse. Furthermore, his distribution the existing races and nations remained unaltered too – just like the basic ideas regarding the non-essential relation between race and language,<sup>3</sup> as well as the dynamics involved in the dissemination of language and civilization.

It was, however, solely as a source of historical evidence that the importance of language was emphasized in these articles. Crawford approached this field of linguistic palaeontology in a manner similar to that discussed at length in the former parts of this dissertation. It provided positive evidence of, among other things, the existence of an indigenous civilization on Java; and, when compared to the evidence offered by old monuments or ancient inscriptions, Crawford stated that “language affords not only far better evidence of this connection with Hinduism, but also of the antiquity of Javanese civilisation.”<sup>4</sup> It was also invoked as negative evidence indicating absent linkages; this could then be employed in the relative dating of, for instance, the alleged Malayan connection with Polynesia which thus, due to the absence of any words of Sanskrit origin, must have taken before the Indian influence in the Indian Archipelago became extensive.<sup>5</sup>

In short, language was by and large used in the same way as before and inscribed more or less a similar importance as earlier. Race had without any doubt attained a steadily more prominent position in Crawford’s universe, in casu especially in the demarcation of the field of study and the definition of its main ethnic entities, but it was still through philology that most of the evidence adduced to sustain the hypothesis was procured. Crawford himself admitted that it was “chiefly through the instrumentality of language”<sup>6</sup> that he endeavoured to sustain his arguments. Which brings us back to the quote with which this part of the dissertation was initiated:

“Of their origin the only reliable testimony we can produce is the evidence afforded by the examination of language, *for of any record of their past history the people themselves are as destitute, as are bees or beavers of the transactions of their predecessors.*”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Crawford 1869a, p.124.

<sup>2</sup> Crawford 1869a, p.130; see also Crawford 1868c, pp.16-21 for an identical analysis of the situation in Polynesia and the dissemination of civilization and civilization indicating terms.

<sup>3</sup> See Crawford 1868c, pp.22-23.

<sup>4</sup> Crawford 1869a, p.123. And, similarly, it was claimed that for the Malayan influence in the Pacific, “the only evidence for this is language, but it is sufficient.” (Crawford 1868c, p.16)

<sup>5</sup> Crawford 1868c, pp.18-19. See also Crawford 1869a, p.123 for similar interpretations on the ancient situation among the Javanese and the civilizational influence they received from India.

<sup>6</sup> Crawford 1869a, p.133.

<sup>7</sup> Crawford 1869a, p.133; my italics.

Yet, despite maintaining roughly the same instrumentalist function and being interpreted in similar manners as before, the philological evidence was now inscribed into a, in some aspects, profoundly changed framework, and hence new meanings were attributed and other, more sinister connotations intimated.

From being stuck on a primitive stage of society, and thus representing a living image of an earlier age of mankind, the heterogeneous societies belonging to the Malayan and Polynesian races of man were by the 1860s, through rhetorical association and analogical reasoning, banished to the basically acultural and essentially ahistoric realm of biology. Beside the focus on their ancient civilization and its routes of dissemination, a parallel discourse simultaneously represented these races as apparently being nothing more than yet another beast among bees and beavers!<sup>1</sup>

#### **4.6 Concluding Remarks.**

Both the continuities and the changes over time within Crawford's approach and in his uses of especially philology and linguistic data thus seem to reflect the theoretical and methodological trends that characterized the period between the Scottish conjectural history of, amongst others, Smith and Ferguson on the one end of the scale, and the evolutionary anthropology of the likes of Lubbock, Tylor, and Morgan on the other. They mirror some of the most heatedly debated themes of the time and they bring to light the competing approaches from which these were addressed; they furthermore illustrate the wider implications – both descriptive, prescriptive, and normative – of a growing rigidification of such categories as race, nation, and civilization when these became framed within an increasingly stringent 'scientific' discourse.

In these processes the ideas on the nature and function of language played a pivotal part. Although it became increasingly challenged by a biological concept of race, the importance of language in the study of man during this period of time can hardly be overestimated. It retained its paramount significance throughout the whole period 1) due to its attributed heuristic value in tracing the history of times or regions where no other (reliable!) source-material existed; as providing a means to sketch 2.a) the universal dynamics and 2.b) the particular trajectories of civilizational progress and dissemination; and finally 3) because of its (ever more contested) importance in the classification and identification of their racial lineages and genealogical ties.

It was this intellectual background that set the stage for the narrative that I have intended to unravel in this fourth and last Part of my dissertation. As usual I have chosen to let Crawford play the leading role, but I have also endeavoured to accord a due importance to the contributions made by some of the other actors on the scene, like W. Marsden, J.D. Lang, W. von Humboldt, J.C.

---

<sup>1</sup> Here I have thus endeavoured to read Crawford as J.A. Boon professedly read Wallace: "By seizing such works not at their hearts but at their somewhat obsessive digressions, we can better assess the source of their appeal, the oddness of their format, the complexity of their discourse, and the mythic categories they trail." (*Boon 1990*, p.24)

Prichard, F. Max Müller, and the scientific polygenists. Only by portraying the part performed by all of these prominent members of this scientific ensemble, with each their politically and religiously infused motives and inclinations, can Crawford's intellectual efforts, scientific contributions, and their wider ideological contexts be sufficiently appreciated and critically assessed.

A few years ago, K. Malik sweepingly concluded that: "Victorian social evolutionism thus rejected the Enlightenment idea that there was a unilinear sequence of social or intellectual stages and that all humanity could reach the highest stage. For the Victorians, different groups had diverged, stopped or regressed along the evolutionary path, according to their racial capacities."<sup>1</sup> Not only did Crawford's linguistic theories and racial thoughts fit neatly into this scheme, but they had also played a not altogether insignificant part in the heterogeneous and complex processes that in the end had brought this state of affairs about.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Malik*, p.88.

<sup>2</sup> This assertion has recently been reiterated and expended upon by e.g. G. Eley: "as the enormous weight of scholarship makes ever more clear, this new machinery of representation and understanding was becoming explicitly racialized via complex and uneven temporalities that have to be carefully charted country by country, but which apparently accelerated from the 1850s and 1860s. (*Eley*, p.227)



# Conclusion.

“John Crawford was neither a synthesist nor a scientific revolutionizer. He disbelieved in the ‘Aryan heresy’; would have no part in the Evolution theory; derided the idea of the Solar myth as in any way incorporated into Christianity; but his labours in ethnology, physical geography and other kindred subjects have helped on the synthesists, and the revolutionizers owe him thanks for at least the use of his shoulders. They sit so much the higher, and know so much more, for what he has done.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Linton, E. Lynn: “The autobiography of Christopher Kirkland”, Vol.III, chapter 3.





Assessing John Crawford's merits in these general terms, the journalist, essayist, novelist, and personal friend, Elizabeth Lynn Linton stressed that, although Crawford's scientific legacy may not be as conspicuous as that of some of his contemporaries, he had nevertheless proved himself to be influential in a number of ways. He was thus both an illustrious representative of- and an active contributor to the acutely politicised and conflict-ridden climate in which the discussions on human nature, history, language, and society took place; these discussions could then be situated within a larger framework of imperial aspiration and colonial enterprise, and where the notions of civilization, race and culture played an absolutely crucial part. Writing in 1885, Linton pointed out that "things which are now accepted as incontestable truths were then only in the nebulous or the tentative stage", and that "during the last twenty or twenty-five years, science has blossomed and fructified with marvellous vigour and rapidity".<sup>1</sup> Before then, however, many now lesser known figures had sown the fruits that others were later to reap; Crawford should be counted amongst those who had cleared the ground and tilled the field, even though the seeds sown by some of these were not always planted intentionally.

The fact that Crawford had not always pertained to the triumphalist side actually renders him all the more eligible for our purpose here; this has allowed us to bring to the fore some of the streams of thought, referential frameworks, and paradigms that, although not having survived the test of time, nonetheless were influential in their own day. These contributed significantly in the shaping of the socio-cultural contexts in which these debates took place, and they both participated in- as well as played a crucial part in the framing of the intellectual environments that housed the divergent conceptualizations and confronting articulations of the ideas and problems which have been discussed here.

Such awareness, with its inclination against any interpretation that demonstrates a too overtly presentist leaning, facilitates a more historicising approach. Furthermore it provides a more densely contextualized analysis of the knowledge production that emanated from the times and places where Crawford either produced his discourses, or where these were consumed, appropriated, and reissued by his allies as well as by his adversaries.

Structuring a large text like this along the trail of actions, events, and involvements of an individual with such diverse interests and talents as John Crawford obviously involves queries just as much about what to exclude as what to include; if not even more so. Crawford's professional versatility and the longevity of his career rendered him particularly apt as constituting the structural spine in my study of the uses and contexts of the notions of civilization, culture, and race, as well as

---

<sup>1</sup> *Linton*, Vol.III, chapter 3.

the changes and continuities that these underwent over time. Yet it also implies that a lot of interesting topics and relevant aspects of Crawford's life and career have been unduly downplayed or left out altogether.

Hence I do not doubt that a sound case could be made, if one was to lament, for instance, the absence of any serious analysis of Crawford's ideas on the colonization of Australia,<sup>1</sup> of his ideas on China and the trade with China,<sup>2</sup> or if the reader would decry the scanty treatment of the time he spent on the Indian subcontinent and the experiences that he undoubtedly gained there. Even within the geographical scope of Southeast Asia I could, and perhaps should, have accorded more space to an analysis and discussion of e.g. the vexed questions regarding how to define, organize, and collect the land revenues on occupied Java, and the crucial importance this aspect played in the colonial modes of governance and colonial structure at large; or on Crawford's ideas regarding the present possibilities and future potential for British commerce and colonization in the region,<sup>3</sup> as formulated both during the writing of HIA, while presiding as Resident in Singapore, and later in life when he, from his base in London, continued to advocate an unencumbered free trade. And most importantly, it could doubtlessly have been beneficial for this project, if I had elaborated much more on Crawford's career as a commercial agent and had to a larger extent included the vast textual production that followed from this function as a keen lobbyist for the Calcutta based merchants and trading houses. The texts that he published in this context encompassed discourses on both political economy and the maladies of trade monopolies, it included schemes advocating an enhanced colonization of India by Europeans, and it addressed EIC's alleged misadministration with its supposed negation of basic legal rights for the European residents in India; most important in this context, however, is the fact that these discourses constituted the key texts around which the heated debates on these controversial topics revolved during the period from approximately 1828 to 1836.<sup>4</sup>

An inclusion of these abovementioned themes and topics could thus advantageously have been incorporated in the project unfolded in this dissertation, if time and space had permitted it. Still, such an implantation of new material and topics would have been in the shape of additions and a

---

<sup>1</sup> As he discussed it in e.g. *Crawford 1834f*, *Crawford 1835b*, and *Crawford 1836*.

<sup>2</sup> Apart from his treatment in his more general historical discourses and his participation in the three volume book on "An Historical and Descriptive Account of China" (1836), Crawford especially discussed these themes in *Crawford 1830a*, *Crawford 1830b*, *Crawford 1831a*, *Crawford 1834b*, *Crawford 1834e*, *Crawford 1835a*, *Crawford 1844*, *Crawford 1858a*, and *Crawford 1858b*, as well as the evidence that he several times gave before various Parliamentary commissions. This in particular provoked responses from R.M. Martin in *Martin 1832a*, *Martin 1832c*, and *Martin 1832c*. For recent treatments of these topics, see also *Hillemann, Kumagai 2008*, and *Kumagai 2010*.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. *Bastin 1953* and *Bastin 1856*; more recently G. Knapman has dealt with some of these themes in *Knapman 2006*, *Knapman 2007*, and *Knapman 2008a*.

<sup>4</sup> In addition to the texts referred to above in note 2, one should also add *Crawford 1828b*, *Crawford 1828c*, *Crawford 1829b*, *Crawford 1831b*, *Crawford 1833b*, *Crawford 1837*, and *Crawford 1839*. All of these spurred the publication of several responses and reviews both in the shape of pamphlets and as articles in, for instance, *Quarterly Review*, *Edinburgh Review*, and *Westminster Review*.

further underpinning of the general argument that I have advanced here, rather than they would present entirely new approaches. It would have introduced new source-material, and it would have extrapolated the discussion of these themes to include new historical fields, as well as readdressing those relatively neglected here – such as, for instance, the issues related to the direct colonial administration and to the trade and politics in the East. But in its essence the project would have remained unaltered. Thus, despite these omissions and the fact that a certain element of arbitrariness cannot be avoided in any selection of source-material, this approach focussing on Crawford's textual production and its contexts has, nonetheless, eliminated the possibility of an altogether unfettered bias in my selection of source-material and framework, so that these would automatically come to fit neatly into my preconceived ideas – without being subjected to any critical, heuristic scrutiny, or being exposed to any discussion regarding how to establish a relevant contextualization and how to choose the adequate interpretive frameworks.

The first Part consisted of a survey of the persistency of the notion of civilization in Crawford's discourses, both over time, across space, and within different fields of knowledge production. As well within the political struggles at home as within the ever expanding colonial peripheries did civilization constitute a central and constantly contested pillar: it was in relation to civilization that culture was defined and that race attained a meaning as not merely a descriptive but also an evaluative concept. Yet the notion of civilization itself also contained internal tensions and exhibited various ambiguities. One of these was the tension between the universality of civilization, both in applicative scope and abstract meaning, on the one hand, and its particular instantiations throughout history on the other; that is, whether the focus should be on the uniformizing tendencies inherent in civilization's universalist dimension, or on the plurality of civilizations such as these were each formed by their own, specific historical trajectories. Another issue concerned the question whether civilization should primarily be perceived as a (stadial) *process*, or it constituted the outcome hereof – an *entity* dialectically defined through its counterpart, savagism (or, subsidiary, barbarism!). These tensions and ambiguities were not, however, mutually exclusive; yet they did represent different approaches and they often resulted in quite divergent interpretations of the same phenomena, as it was repeatedly illustrated through Crawford's various discourses on all these themes.

Culture presented either an oppositional concept to civilization, or it acted as a supplement to it. Often coined as a superstructure that represented the non-material, and allegedly more elevated or spiritual, values of a more advanced society, culture could be invoked to rebuke what was seen as the spiritless juggernaut of blind progress, but it could also serve as an analytical alternative to

civilization. Whereas the notion of stadial civilization in principle was universal, and hence it could be seamlessly implemented as the theoretical part of an inclusive liberal imperialism, the culture-orientated ideas remained more tied to the framework of the burgeoning nation-state, and which emphasized either a national essence or focussed on the particular historical path that had led to the birth of the modern British (or perhaps rather English) nation; besides, these ideas were often associated with a confrontational attitude towards the growing industrialism and the rising middle class. In this context, the Imperial project would be framed as an advanced defence of the British state and as a way of disseminating its specific national values and ethos.<sup>1</sup> Although Crawford undeniably first and foremost abided by the first approach, we have seen how his knowledge production ironically could be adduced by Coleridge in support of the latter.

As the case study on Crawford's ideas on race in relation to the case of the 'Eastern Negroes' amply demonstrates, civilization continued to be the most important element even within this context. Always an inveterate racialist – who operated within a fixist scheme and either implicitly attributed or explicitly ascribed each race a set of innate qualities – it was nonetheless their presumed developmental potential that occupied Crawford's mind and permeated his discourses; it was in this civilization-related and prescriptive (or, more precisely, 'inhibitive') function, rather than as a classificatory unit in its own right, that the concept of race over time assumed an ever increasing importance in Crawford's discourses, despite its ubiquitous presence from the very onset.

In the second Part we dug a step further and examined the prefiguring influence of especially civilization, but also of race and ideas on national or cultural essences, upon the different and competing manners in which Southeast Asia and its inhabitants were conceptually approached by the British during this period. First it traced the changes and the continuities in the coining of the terms, and their accompanying framing of the pre-analytical entities, through which these spaces and their inhabitants were approached. These geographical entities would not merely result from-, but also always invariably precede, the actual perceptions, analyses, and assessments of the societies in the region, and as such the notions of civilization, race and culture/history exerted a crucial, constitutive influence already before being explicitly invoked in the discourses *on* these themes. Similar forces were at play in the discernment of the chronology and in the establishment of the historical periods through which Southeast Asia's past could be structured or organized. The modes of periodization both followed from- and were presumed in the approaches that guided these writings on the history of the region. An important aspect discussed in this context regarded the assumptions on the achieved level of civilization of the different peoples in the region, and of their

---

<sup>1</sup> In terms of colonial historiography, T.B. Macaulay has often been seen as emblematic of the former, whereas J.A. Froude's writings epitomized the latter. See e.g. chapters 3-4 in *Koditschek 2011* for such an interpretation; for more on Froude as a Carlyle inspired colonial historian and theorist, the classic work would be *Bodelsen*, pp.176-205.

accompanying abilities to express themselves in the accurate and descriptive manner that was deemed necessary, if their own descriptions should be perceived as containing reliable historical narratives. Hence these considerations ultimately determined the types of source-material that were deemed admissible in the historical analysis, and this important question produced some of the most heated debates between Crawford and other scholar-administrators as well as amateur Orientalists.

The notion of Oriental despotism made up one of the most persistent and fundamental tropes invoked in the descriptions of the (Southeast) Asian societies and their peoples. It prescribed the predominant topoi through which these societies were to be assessed and also, to a large degree, how these should adequately interpreted; hence, elements that on the surface appeared to indicate the existence of an advanced society and a just state, such as an apparent large degree of social mobility and high wages, could become sure signs of the perverted state of society in which these countries lingered. However, when it came to trace the origin of Oriental despotism the opinions differed. To some, like Raffles, Oriental despotism seemed to have originated in specific cultural traits like, for instance, in the main tenets inherent in the Muslim faith. Others would instead attribute these tendencies to innate racial qualities, such as S.F. Alatas has demonstrated in his study on “The Myth of the Lazy Native” and its ideological implications;<sup>1</sup> or they would tend to identify its source in the just as ineluctable effects of the prevailing climate and other environmental factors dominant in the Orient. Crawford, however, did not detect its foundations as being ingrained in the racial setup, or as emanating from the cultural superstructure; on the contrary, it resulted from the basic material conditions upon which the societies in the Orient were founded, and which, in an almost overdetermined manner, prescribed the later development of civilization and the unfolding of its societal forms which inevitably led to despotism – not merely as a system of governance, but as an all pervasive societal form and cultural trait. Right from the dawn of time and the onset of civilization, ‘progress’ had here taken a different, and deviant, direction from that which Europe had experienced, and where the rise in civilization could (in time) be coupled with a corresponding growth in liberty. In the Oriental realm – or, in Crawford’s view, within any tropical sphere where civilization was originally dependent on irrigational systems – ascendant civilization had, however, resulted in the opposite state; here civilization had bred ever more bondage for the ordinary subject! Despite being inscribed in a thoroughly universalist framework, the Orient (and the tropics) thus differed essentially from the norms implicitly prescribed by the example of Europe and in particular by Great Britain. This could, obviously, be taken to imply almost an ideological imperative towards a benevolent British intervention in these advanced, yet aberrant, societies.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Alatas.

The third Part primarily addressed philological topics, and I tried here to show how these were inextricably interwoven with the entwined and often competing issues of civilization, culture, and (albeit to a lesser degree) race. My main concern was to examine how these notions and the studies of language were mutually dependent upon each other, both on the epistemological level as well as in terms of theory, methodology, and heuristics. Not only did language contribute with the main body of evidence used in defining and delineating the dissemination and progress of civilization, as well as the diffusion and branching out of nations, but the tropes of a universal and stadial civilization and that of a genealogical tree-of-nations did also provide the two main referential frameworks through which the philological field was approached; these, in each their own manner, facilitated the selection and interpretation of linguistic data as well as the subsequent invocation of these as evidence in support or in rejection of a given historical hypothesis. Colonial philology was, as T.R. Trautmann continuously has emphasized and which this project only seems to confirm, before anything else an auxiliary discipline, primarily serving to procure evidence that could then be used in ethnological or historical studies.

Yet, as it has been argued, civilization and culture<sup>1</sup> were not merely oppositional, but also often mutually dependent. The methodology of the *word list*, so fundamental (although not necessarily essential!) to the genealogical approach, thus presupposed a stadial progress of civilization; this included the existence of an *initial state*, characterized by the existence of only the most rudimentary objects, the most primitive concepts, and the most basic level of social organization – and hence only of terms designating these! The stadial framework, with its materialist-biological theory on the origin of language, on the other hand operated with historical actors in the shape of national or racial entities, delineated and demarcated by the criteria stipulated by the methodologies associated with the genealogical tree-of-nations approach. In sum, the two tropes represented approaches that in practice were profoundly intertwined, and even though Marsden and Crawford in many ways can be seen as emblematic of each of these two approaches, the examples provided by the other philosophers, philologists, and ethnologists discussed in this Part suggest the existence of the wide variety of interpretive frameworks that were available to the student of the intersected questions of human origin, its early history, the linguistic, racial, and national diversity, as well as the progress, stagnation, or degeneration of civilization. Despite representing each their fundamentally divergent framework, Marsden's and Crawford's approaches to some degree depended on each other, and, instead of constituting an unbridgeable gap, they composed the two extremes within a sliding scale, offering ample space for different investigative strategies and discrepant explanative modes.

---

<sup>1</sup> As this was expressed through the particular historical trajectory of a given nation or race.

In the last Part all of these themes have been wrapped up and integrated into a larger chronological narrative. By focussing on the two specific topics of Malayness and the origins of the link between the Indian Archipelago and Madagascar, I traced the intricate interplay of the notions of civilization, culture, and race in addressing these questions. These notions were in particular expressed though evidence extracted from language and race, but they included arguments adduced from textual philology and antiquarianism too. These concepts were also deeply implicated in the sliding, and often conflated, scales of analysis that were applied, for instance in the investigation of Malayness; this examination involved considerations regarding both nation, civilization, and race, as well as language which both constituted an object of analysis in itself and provided the major part of the evidence in the discernment of the other national, civilizational, or racial entities. Yet, as this Part also showed, the importance attributed to language as the main provider of evidence waned throughout the period: it gradually became challenged by racial evidence which increasingly supplemented the linguistic evidence, albeit it never supplanted it entirely. This obviously influenced the manner in which these topics were addressed and interpreted; it heralded a new and more rigid paradigm that appeared to prioritize difference over unity, and where physiology prescribed the future potential of any given nation, people, or race. Crawford became, as we have seen, increasingly more attentive towards the explanative powers vested in the biological concept of race from at least 1834 and onwards. By the 1850s it had even become possible to read and interpret his most linguistically orientated discourses within such a rigorously racialized framework; and in the following decade Crawford would himself re-appropriate this approach in his prolific work within the institutional framework of the Ethnological Society. Despite this undeniable ascendancy of racial concerns within Crawford's discourses, civilization, however, continued to constitute his primary concern.

One of the focal points of the analysis was the constitutive influence of the geographical contexts upon the ways in which the key texts on these topics were produced, circulated, and consumed during the crucial discursive moments; this approach has facilitated an examination of how the ubiquitous presence of the foundational concepts of civilization, culture, and race in these discussions still resulted in widely divergent interpretations and uses of these notions, when they were invoked within their local, yet interconnected, social, cultural, and political environments. This has allowed us to insist on the conceptual continuity over space and time, whilst simultaneously maintaining an open mind towards the contextualized and embedded locatedness of all utterances – and hence acknowledging the element of discursive contingency.

Based on what has been examined throughout these four Parts it seems not entirely unreasonable to infer that not only were the ideas of civilization, race, and culture/history instrumental in John Crawfurd's and his contemporaries' approach to- and conceptualization of the colonial subjects, but they also provided a conceptual template that quite seamlessly managed to link the historical narratives they provided with the cotemporary colonial challenges and with a carving out of the future trajectories for the colonial project(s). Or, in other words, discursively it embraced both the realm of the authoritative knowledge production on non-European societies and the (implicit) ideological dimensions of the imperial enterprise to such a degree that these could not be dissociated from one another neither in theory nor practice. These discourses were hinged upon those three fundamental notions and their ability to address the universal as well as the particular, their capacity to encompass the past, present and future within one interpretive framework, and not at least their provision of a conceptual common ground which also, however, facilitated the possibilities of fundamental dissent in the actual interpretations.

Throughout this dissertation I have thus endeavoured to map some of the ubiquitous aspects and continuous features within the contested fields of colonial knowledge production during the period spanning from high noon of the 'Imperial Meridian' and up to the mid-Victorian era. In terms of the knowledge production, its emblematic epistemes and reigning paradigms, the analysis started with the period where the tenets of conjectural history began to challenge the textual Orientalism, associated with Sir William Jones, as the prevailing mode of colonial knowledge production, and it ended with what has often been seen as the triumph of racial science in the 1860s – although, as argued here, this was by no means uncontested in its own day. However, instead of merely focussing myopically upon the elements of continuity over time and space, I have also accorded an ample attention to a detection of the main discrepancies and fissures within this field. Although the concepts of *civilization*, *race*, and *culture* carried with them a certain notion of universal applicability, the actual articulation of such ubiquitous aspects, nonetheless, always depended on the specific contexts of production, transmission, or reception.

Besides, although a significant part of this dissertation has been dedicated to a *reading for the rationale* – and hence a tracing of such rationales that could duly account for- and dissolve the contradictions within my source-material, and thus render these more apparent than real – there is still a considerable residue left which defies any such synthesising reading. These discursive dissonances and conceptual contradictions can only be explained by taking recourse to a contextual analysis of the actual political interests, ideological biases, and personal inclinations.



From what has been delineated over the last some 400 pages, it can be, I think, ascertained that Crawford's textual production was before anything else characterized by a strong element of continuity, both over time and in the span of the themes he dealt with. Throughout his entire career Crawford operated with a framework in which civilization occupied the central position both as a problem, as a field of research, and as an approach that stipulated the choice of methodology, influenced the formulation of the theories, and finally determined the manners in which the used information was interpreted and invoked as evidence. Culture and race were also important, both within Crawford's own discourses and, perhaps in particular, within those of his opponents; as such they fed upon each other and were to a large extent mutually dependent in terms of their thematic scopes and of their dynamic demarcations in relation to one another. Although present throughout the entire period, the notion of race gained in explanative importance over the years, and by the 1850s it appeared to have become the probably most important theme within the discussions on the Southeast Asian past and present state; yet even then civilization continued to constitute the main concern, and race had primarily attained its importance in relation to controversies regarding the alleged (inhibiting) influence of some racial traits upon the progress of civilization.

However, the issue of the growing influence of the concept of race upon the discourses through which this colonial knowledge production was expressed (and implemented) could almost as easily have facilitated a narrative bent on discontinuity and on detecting the crucial moment of change. In Crawford's case such a moment would then have happened during the 1830s – or in 1834 to be more exact.



## Bibliography.

### Abbreviations.

- **BAAS:** *British Association for the Advancement of Science.*
- **ER:** *Edinburgh Review.*
- **FQR:** *Foreign Quarterly Review.*
- **HIA:** *History of the Indian Archipelago*, 3 Vols., Edinburgh 1820.
- **JES:** *Journal of the Ethnological Society of London*, 1848-1854.
- **JIA:** *Journal of the Indian archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Singapore, Vol.1-9 (1847-1855), and 2<sup>nd</sup> Series Vol.1-4 (1856-1863).
- **JMBRAS:** *Journal of the Malayan/Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (NOTE – names over time!)
- **JRGS:** *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society.*
- **QR:** *Quarterly Review.*
- **TES:** *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London*, 1861-1869.
- **WR:** *Westminster Review.*

### Archival Material.

- British Library (BL), Manuscript Collections, Add.30,353 *Reports on the island of Java to Lieutenant-Governor Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles; circ.1811-1815. Copies; with notes by Captain G[odfrey] Baker.*
- British Library, India Office Library and Records, Private Papers, MSS EUR D457: Crawford, J.: *Description of India*, 2 vols. (written 1832-1833).
- British Library, India Office Library and Records, Private Papers MSS K239/5 (Raffles Collection); Jambulus: *Observations on article in the 45<sup>th</sup> number of the Edinburgh Review, professing to be a review of the Grammar and Dictionary of the Malayan Language by William Marsden, F.R.S., and entitled “History and Languages of the Indian Islands”.*
- British Library, India Office Library and Records, Private Papers, Mack Private 2/34 & 35: Correspondence written by J. Crawford.
- British Library, India Office Library and Records, Private Papers, Mack Private 85. Crawford, J.: *Review of a Grammar of the Malayan Language with an Introduction & Praxis*, by William Marsden, F.R.S..
- Darwin Correspondence Project. Can be accessed at: <http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/>

- *The Crawford Papers: A Collection of Official Records relating to the Mission of Dr. John Crawford sent to Siam by the Government of India in the year 1821*, National Library, Bangkok, 1915 (Reprinted, OUP 1971).
- Mackenzie, C.: A general View of the Results of Investigations into Geography, History Antiquities, and Literature in the Island of Java, by Lieut.-Col. C. Mackenzie in the Years 1811-12-13. Reprinted in Blagden, C.O.: Catalogue of Manuscripts in European Languages Belonging to the Library of the India Office. Vol.I: The Mackenzie Collections. Part I: The 1822 Collection & the Private Collection, OUP 1916, pp.xxiii-xxxii. (*Mackenzie 1813*)

### **Contemporary Works of Reference.**

- *East-India Register and Directory*, perused for the years 1803-1828.

### **Contemporary Published Texts.**

- Anon.: *In the Press*, in *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and Its Dependencies*, Vol.VI (Jun.-Dec. 1818), p.76.
- Anon.: *Review of 'History of the Indian Archipelago'*, in *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and Its Dependencies*, Vol.X (July-Dec., 1820), pp.145-152.
- Anon.: *Crawford's Indian Archipelago* (Review), in *The British Review and London Critical Journal*, Vol.XVI (1820), pp.318-345.
- Anon.: *Remarks on Crawford's 'History of the Indian Archipelago'*, in *The Edinburgh Magazine and Literary miscellany; A New Series of the Scots Magazine*, Vol.VII (July-Dec., 1820), pp.26-32 & 120-122.
- Anon.: *Review of 'History of the Indian Archipelago*, in *The Literary Gazette; and Journal of Belles Lettres, Arts, Sciences, Etc. for the Year 1820*, (1820), pp.338-340
- Anon.: *Review of 'History of the Indian Archipelago'*, in *The Eclectic Review*, New Series Vol.XVI (1821), pp.228-240.
- Anon.: *Civilization*, in *The London Magazine*, New Series, Vol.III (1825), pp.207-213.
- Anon.: *Indian Taxation of Englishmen. The Indian Stamp Act, With some Observations on the East India Company's Government of British Subjects in Calcutta*, London 1828.
- Anon.: *Review of 'View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation'* in *Monthly Review*, (New and Improved Series) Vol.III, No.II (1834), pp.264-277.
- Anon.: *Review of 'View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation; Demonstrating Their Ancient Discovery and Progressive Settlement of the Continent of America'*, in *JRGS*, Vol.4 (1834), pp.258-267.

- Anon.: *South Sea Islands*, in *American Quarterly Review*, Vol.XX, No.XXXIX (1836), pp.1-27.
- Anon.: *Dutch Colonies and Colonial Policy*, in *The British and Foreign Review*, No.XXIII (1841), pp.396-461.
- Anon.: *Notice of Mr. Crawford's Descriptive Dictionary*, in *JIA*, New Series Vol.I (1856), pp.291-295.
- Anon.: *Death of Mr. John Crawford, Hon. F.A.S.L.*, in *The Anthropological Review*, Vol.Vi (1868), pp.324-325.
- Anon.: *Mr. John Crawford, Obituary Memoirs*, in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, Entirely New Series, Vol.I (1868), p.127.
- Anon.: *John Crawford*, in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch Indië*, Derde Serie 2de Jaargang, Tweede Deel, pp.157-161, 1868.
- Adelung, F.: *An Historical Sketch of Sanskrit Literature*, Oxford 1832, (Compiled and translated by H.H. Wilson)
- Adelung, J.C. & Vater, J.S.: *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in beynahe fünfhundert Sprachen un Mundarten*, 4 vols. Berlin 1806-1817.
- Anderson, J.: *Considerations relative to the Malayan Peninsula, and the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca*, Prince of Wales Island (Penang) 1824.
- Anderson, J.: *Mission to the East Coast of Sumatra in 1823*, London 1826.
- Anderson, J.: *Acheen, and the Ports on the North and East Coast of Sumatra*, London 1840.
- Assay, C.: *Review of the Administration, Value, and State of the Colony of Java with Its Dependencies, As It Was, – As It Is, – and As It May Be*, London 1816.
- Assay, C.: *On the Trade to China and the Indian Archipelago with Observations on the Insecurity of the British Interests in that Quarter*, in *The Pamphleteer* Vol. XIV, No.XXVIII (1819), pp.516-543.
- Balbi, A.: *Introduction a L'atlas ethnographique du globe*, Paris 1826.
- Balbi, A.: *Abrégé de géographie, rédigé sur un nouveau plan*, Paris 1833.
- Barrantes, V.: *Guerras piraticas de Filipinas, contra mindanaos y joloanos*, Madrid 1878.
- Barrow, Sir J.: *Review of "Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea and Beering<sup>1</sup> Straits, for the Purpose of Exploring a North-East Passage, Undertaken in the Years 1815-1818, Under the Expense of His Highness the Chancellor of the Empire, Count Romanzoff, in the Ship*

---

<sup>1</sup> Original spelling!

*Rurick, Under the Command of the Lieutenant in the Russian Imperial Navy, Otto von Kotzebue*", in *Quarterly Review*, Vol.XXVI, No.52 (1822), pp.341-364.

- Beeckman, D.: *A Voyage to and from the Island of Borneo*, London 1718 (Reprint in *Colonial History Series*, London 1973).
- Begbie, P.J.: *The Malayan Peninsula*, Madras 1834.
- Beke, C.T.: *Views in Ethnography, the Classification of Language, the Progress of Civilization, and the Natural History of Man*, in *The Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, Vol.XVIII (1835), pp.285-296.
- Bendyshe, T. & Blumenbach, J.F.: *The Anthropological Treatises of Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, ..., Translated and Edited from the Latin, German, and French Originals by Thomas Bendyshe, M.A., V.P.A.S.L.*, London 1865.
- Bernaldez, E.: *Reseña historica de la guerra al sur de Filipinas, sostenida por las armas españolas contra las piratas de aquel archipelago, desde las conquista hasta nuestros días*, Madrid 1857.
- Bickmore, A.S.: *Travels in the East Indian Archipelago*, New York 1869.
- Blomfield, E.: *General View of the World, Geographical, Historical, and Philosophical; on a Plan Entirely New*, 2 Vols., London 1807.
- Bopp, F.: *Über die Verwandtschaft der malayisch-polynesischen Sprachen mit den indisch-europäischen*, Berlin 1841.
- Bunsen, C.C.J.: *Christianity and Mankind, Their Beginnings and Prospects*, 7 Vols., London 1854.
- Bunsen, J.J.C., Meyer, C., & Max Müller, F.: *Three Linguistic Dissertations, Read at the Meeting of the British Association at Oxford*, London 1848.<sup>1</sup>
- Burke, L.: *Art.III. – Types of Mankind*, in *Westminster Review*, New Series, vol.IX (Jan. & Apr., 1856), pp.356-386.
- Cabell, J.L.: *The Testimony of Modern Science to the Unity of Mankind. Being a Summary of the Conclusions Announced by the Highest Authorities in the Several Departments of Physiology, Zoölogy, and Comparative Philology in Favour of the Specific Unity and Common Origin of All the Varieties of Man*, New York 1859.
- Chamisso, A. Von: *A View of the Great Ocean, of Its Islands. And Its Coasts*, in *Kotzebue*, Vol.II, pp.353-406.
- Coleridge, S.T.: *On the Constitution of the Church and State, according to the idea of each: With Aids Toward a Right Judgement on the Late Catholic Bill*, London 1830.

---

<sup>1</sup> An excerpt taken from the *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science for 1847*.

- Crawford, J./Nowell, A/Rickards.: *The Present System of our East-India Government and Commerce considered*, London 1813.<sup>1</sup>
- Crawford, J.: *Publications respecting the Eastern Peninsula of India*, in *Edinburgh Review*, 22:44 (Jan. 1814), pp.331-363.<sup>2</sup> (Crawford, 1814a)
- Crawford, J.: *History and Languages of the Indian Islands*, in *Edinburgh Review*, 23:45 (Apr.1814), pp.151-189.<sup>3</sup> (Crawford, 1814b)
- Crawford, J.: *The Ruins of Prambanan in Java*, in *Asiatick Researches*, Vol.XIII (1816), pp. 337-368. (Crawford 1816a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Existence of the Hindu religion in the island of Bali*, in *Asiatick Researches*, Vol.XIII (1816), pp.128-170. (Crawford 1816b)
- Crawford, J.: *An Inscription from the Kawi, or Ancient Javanese Language*, in *Transactions of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences*, Vol.8, 1816. (Crawford 1816c)
- Crawford, J.: *Trade of the Indian Islands*, in *Edinburgh Review*, 29:57 (Nov. 1817), pp.35-52. (Crawford 1817a)
- Crawford, J.: *Some Account of a Singular race of Negroes Lately discovered in the Remote Mountains of the Indian Archipelago*, in *Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany; A New Series of the Scots Magazine*, Vol.I (Aug-Dec 1817), pp.239-240. (Crawford 1817b)
- Crawford, J.: *Chinese Embassy and Trade*, in *Edinburgh Review*, 29:58 (Feb. 1818), pp.433-454.
- Crawford, J.: "The History of Java." By Thomas Stamford Raffles, Esq. Late Lieutenant-Governor of that Island and its Dependencies. In *Edinburgh Review*, 31:62 (Mar. 1819), pp.395-413.
- Crawford, J.: *History of the Indian Archipelago*, 3 Vols., London & Edinburgh 1820. (reprint: London 1967)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Ruins of Boro Budor in Java*<sup>4</sup>, in *Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay*, Vol.II, 1820, pp.154-166 (and in addition 7 accompanying engravings). (Crawford, 1817/1820)

<sup>1</sup> Authorship attributed to Crawford in Bastin 1953, whereas Stokes states that it was written by Rickards, and in the *Grey Pamphlets Collection* A. Nowell is identified as the author; any final conclusion on this topic is pending on further research.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Scottish Orientalism: From Robertson to James Mill*, in *The Historical Journal* Vol.25, No.1 (Mar., 1982), pp.43-69 Jane Rendall ascribes John Crawford as the author of this article "on the basis of internal evidence" (p.62, n.73). For further information, see the Appendix. *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900 I* (1966, p.451) states that the authorship is "[u]nidentified. Possibly John Crawford".

<sup>3</sup> See the Appendix for a further discussion regarding the attribution of the authorship to this article.

<sup>4</sup> The article, published in 1820, was read to the society on August 26<sup>th</sup>, 1817.

- Crawford, J.: *Der Indische Archipelagus besonders in Bezug auf Handel und Verkehr*, Jena 1821.<sup>1</sup>
- Crawford, J.: *Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Courts of Siam and Cochin China, Exhibiting a View of the Actual State of Those Kingdoms*, London 1828 (Reprint, New Delhi 2000). (Crawford 1828a)
- Crawford, J.: *A View of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Free Trade and Colonisation of India*, London 1828. (Crawford 1828b)
- Crawford, J.: *Indian Taxation of Englishmen. The Indian Stamp Act, With some Observations on the East India Company's Government of British Subjects in Calcutta*, in *Edinburgh Review*, 47:93 (Jan. 1828), pp.134-184. (Crawford 1828c)<sup>2</sup>
- Crawford, J.: *Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Court of Ava in the Year 1827*, London 1829. (Crawford 1829a)
- Crawford, J.: *A View of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Free Trade and Colonisation of India, Second Edition, Enlarged*, London 1829. (Crawford 1829b)
- Crawford, J.: *An Inquiry into Some of the Principal Monopolies of the East India Company*, London 1830. (Crawford 1830a)
- Crawford, J.: *Chinese Monopoly Examined*, London 1830. (Crawford 1830b)
- Crawford, J.: *East India Company – The China Question. (Or) Reports from, and Minutes of Evidence taken before, the Select Committees of the House of Lords and Commons, on the Affairs of the East India Company* London 1831. (Crawford 1831a)
- Crawford, J. (ed.): *Letters from British Settlers in the Interior of India, Descriptive of Their Own Condition, and That of the Native Inhabitants under the Government of the East India Company. With Notes*, London 1831. (Crawford 1831b)
- Crawford, J.: *Sugar without Slavery*, in *London and Westminster Review*, 18 (Apr. 1833), pp.247-262. (Crawford 1833a)
- Crawford, J.: *Notes on the Settlement or Colonization of British Subjects in India: With an Appendix of Proofs and Illustrations*, London 1833. (Crawford 1833b)
- Crawford, J.: *The Countries, Nations, and Languages of the Oceanic Region*, in *Foreign Quarterly Review*, Vol.XIV (Dec. 1834), pp.369-412. (Crawford 1834a)

---

<sup>1</sup> This book contains a translation of Vol.III, Book IX of HIA (on “Commerce”) and a short introduction.

<sup>2</sup> This was a review of a pamphlet with the same name published in London in 1828 but allegedly written in Calcutta. (Taylor, pp.299 & 306) It seems likely that the publication of the pamphlet in London was arranged by Crawford himself; he had recently been become the agent who should promote the interests of the private Calcutta merchants in London and influence the Parliament. The authorship of this review is ascribed to Crawford in Stokes, p.130.



- Crawford, J.: *Voyage of Ship Amherst*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XX (1834), pp.22-47. (Crawford 1834b)
- Crawford, J.: *Monopoly on Food*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XX (1834), pp.378-411. (Crawford 1834c)
- Crawford, J.: *Aristocratic Taxation*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XXI (1834), pp.140-185. (Crawford 1834d)
- Crawford, J.: *Chinese Empire and Trade*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XXI (1834), pp.221-256. (Crawford 1834e)
- Crawford, J.: *New South Australian Colony*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XXI (1834), pp.441-476. (Crawford 1834f)
- Crawford, J.: *Tea and Tea Trade*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XXII (1835), pp.361-403. (Crawford 1835a)
- Crawford, J.: *South Australian Colony*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XXIII (1835), pp.213-239. (Crawford 1835b)
- Crawford, J.: *The Colonial Expenditure*, in *Westminster Review*, Vol.XXIV (1836), pp.1-31.
- Crawford, J.: *A Sketch of the Commercial Resources and Monetary and Mercantile System of British India, with Suggestions for Their Improvement, by Means of Banking Establishments*, Reprinted in Chaudhuri, pp.217-316. (Org. 1837)
- Crawford, J.: *An Appeal from the Inhabitants of British India to the Justice of the People of England: A Popular Inquiry into the Operation of the System of Taxation in British India*, London 1839.
- Crawford, J.: *Des Chinois émigrés dans les établissements anglais et hollandais*, in *Revue de L'Orient: Bulletin de la Société Orientale*, Vol.5:17-20 (1844), pp.293-297.
- Crawford, J.: *On the Malayan and Polynesian Languages and Races*, in *JES*, Vol.I (1848), pp.330-74.<sup>1</sup> (Crawford 1848a)
- Crawford, J.: *A Scheme for Representing Malayan Sounds by Roman Letters*, in *JIA*, Vol.II (1848), pp.564-570.(Crawford 1848b)
- Crawford, J.: *Piracy in the Eastern Archipelago*, in *The Examiner*, Oct.21, 1848, Issue 2125.
- Crawford, J.: *Vital Statistics of a District in Java*, in *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, Vol.12:1 (Feb. 1849), pp.60-71.<sup>2</sup>
- Crawford, J.: *On the Alphabets of the India Archipelago*, in *JES*, Vol.II (1850), pp.246-261.

---

<sup>1</sup> Also Printed in the *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal*, Vol.XLIV (1848), pp.155-200, and in *JIA*, Vol.II, pp.183-228.

<sup>2</sup> This article contained some preliminary remarks by Lt.-Col. W.H. Sykes, Vice-President of the society.

- Crawford, J.: *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language, with a Preliminary Dissertation*, 2 Vols., London 1852. (Crawford 1852a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Negro Races of the Indian Archipelago and Pacific Islands*, in *Report of the 21st of the BAAS;; Held at Ipswich in July 1851*, London 1852, pp.86-88 (Crawford 1852b)
- Crawford, J.: *History of Coffee*, in *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, Vol.15:1 (Apr. 1852), pp.50-58. (Crawford 1852c)
- Crawford, J.: *The Nations of India and Their Manners*, in *ER*, 98:199, pp.33-61. (Crawford 1853a)
- Crawford, J.: *The Negroes of the Indian Archipelago and Pacific Islands*, in *Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal, Exhibiting a View of the progressive Discoveries and Improvements in the Sciences and the Arts*, vol.LIV (Oct 1852-Apr 1853), pp.175-179.<sup>1</sup> (Crawford 1853b)
- Crawford, J.: *On the History and Consumption of Tobacco*, in *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, Vol.16:1 (Mar. 1853), pp.45-52. (Crawford 1853c)
- Crawford, J.: *A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands & Adjacent Countries*, London 1856. (reprint: Varanasi 1974 [also OUP, 1971])
- Crawford, J.: *On China and the Chinese*, in *Journal of the United Service Institution*, Vol.1 (1858), pp.51-58. (Crawford 1858a)
- Crawford, J.: *China and Its Trade. A Paper Read by John Crawford to the Philosophical and Literary Society of Leeds*, London 1858. (Crawford 1858b)
- Crawford, J.: *India, as Connected with a Native Army*, in *Journal of the United Service Institution*, Vol.2 (1859), pp.177-190. (Crawford 1859a)
- Crawford, J.: Review of *On the Origin on Species by Means of Natural Selection*, in *The Examiner*, Dec.3, pp.772-773. (Crawford 1859b)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Conditions Which Favour, Retard, or Obstruct the Early Civilization of Man*, in *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London TES*, Vol.1 (1861), pp.154-177. (Crawford 1861a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Aryan or Indo-Germanic Theory*, TES, Vol.1 (1861), pp.268-286. (Crawford 1861b)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Classification of the Races of Man*, in TES, Vol.1 (1861), pp.354-378. (Crawford 1861c)

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is identical with Crawford 1852b.

- Crawford, J.: *On the Effects of Commixture, Locality, Climate, and Food on the Races of Man*, in TES Vol.1 (1861), pp.76-92. (Crawford 1861d)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Antiquity of Man, from the Evidence of Language*, in *Report of the 31<sup>st</sup> Meeting at the BAAS; Held at Manchester 1861*, London 1862, pp.191-193.
- Crawford, J.: *On the Connexion between Ethnology and Physical Geography*, in TES Vol. 2 (1863), pp.4-23. (Crawford 1863a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Numerals as evidence of the Progress of Civilization*, in TES Vol.2 (1863), pp.84-111. (Crawford 1863b)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Antiquity of Man from the Evidence of Language*, in TES, Vol.2 (1863), pp.170-181. (Crawford 1863c)
- Crawford, J.: *Notes on Sir Charles Lyell's Antiquity of Man*, in *Anthropological Review* Vol.1, No.1, pp.172-176. (Crawford 1863d)
- Crawford, J.: *On Colour as a Test of the Races of Man*, in TES, Vol.2 (1863), pp.251-260. (Crawford 1863e)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Commixture of the Races of Man as Affecting the Progress of Civilization (Europe)*, in TES, Vol.2 (1863), pp.201-213. (Crawford 1863f)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Relation of the Domesticated Animals to Civilization*, in TES (1863), Vol.2, pp.387-468. (Crawford 1863g)
- Crawford, J.: *On Language as a Test of the races of Man*, in TES, Vol.3 (1865), pp.1-9. (Crawford 1865a)
- Crawford, J.: *On Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man", and on Professor Huxley's "Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature"*, in TES, Vol.3 (1865), pp.58-70. (Crawford 1865b)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Early Migrations of Man*, in TES, Vol.3 (1865), pp.335-350. (Crawford 1865c)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Commixture of the Races of Man as Affecting the Progress of Civilisation*, in TES, Vol.3 (1865), pp.98-122. (Crawford 1865d)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Supposed Stone, Bronze, and Iron Ages of Society*, in TES, Vol.4 (1866), pp.1-12. (Crawford 1866a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the So-Called Celtic Languages in Reference to the Question of Race*, TES vol.4 (1866), pp.71-100. (Crawford 1866b)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Physical and Mental Characteristics of the Negro*, in TES, Vol.4 (1866), pp.212-239. (Crawford 1866c)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Origin and History of Written Language*, TES, Vol.5 (1867), pp.96-104. (Crawford 1867a)

- Crawford, J.: *On an Ancient Hindu Sacrificial Bell, with Inscription Found in the Northern Island of the New Zealand Group*, TES, Vol.5 (1867), pp.150-154. (Crawford 1867b)
- Crawford, J.: *On Caesar's Account of Britain and Its Inhabitants in Reference to Ethnology*, TES Vol.5 (1867), pp.202-215. (Crawford 1867c)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Physical and Mental Characteristics of the European and Asiatic Races of Man*, in TES, Vol.5 (1867), pp.58-81. (Crawford 1867d)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Invention of Writing Materials in Reference to Ethnology*, in TES, Vol.5 (1867), pp.155-161. (Crawford 1867e)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Plurality of the races of Man*, in TES, Vol.6 (1868), pp.49-58. (Crawford 1868a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Supposed Aborigines of India, as Distinguished from Its Civilized Inhabitants*, TES Vol.6 (1868), pp.59-71. (Crawford 1868b)
- Crawford, J.: *The Polynesian or Maori Race of Man and Its Prehistoric Career*, London 1868 (Privately Printed). (Crawford 1868c)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Antiquity of Man*, in TES, Vol.6 (1868), pp.233-245. (Crawford 1868d)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Classification of the Races of Man According to the Form of the Skull*, in TES Vol.6 (1868), pp.127-134. (Crawford 1868e)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Vegetable and Animal Food of the Natives of Australia in Reference to Social Position, with a Comparison between the Australians and Some Other Races of Man*, in TES, Vol.6 (1868), pp.112-122. (Crawford 1868f)
- Crawford, J.: *On the History and Migration of Cultivated Plants Used as Condiments*, in TES, Vol.6 (1868), pp.188-206. (Crawford 1868g)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Skin, the Hair, and the Eyes, as Tests of the Races of Man*, in TES, Vol.6 (1868), pp.144-149. (Crawford 1868h)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Malayan Race of Man and its Prehistoric Career*, in TES Vol.7 (1869), pp.119-33. (Crawford 1869a)
- Crawford, J.: *On the Theory of the Origin of Species by Natural Selection in the Struggle for Life*, in TES, Vol.7 (1869), pp.27-38. (Crawford 1869b)
- Dalton, W.: *The Nest Hunters; or Adventures in the Indian Archipelago*, London 1863.
- Darwin, C.: *The Voyage of the Beagle*, London 1997 (reprint of 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1845).
- Degérando, J.-M.: *The Observation of Savage Peoples* (transl. by F.G.T. Moore and with an introduction by E.E. Evans-Pritchard), London 1969 (orig. Paris 1800)
- Dumont d'Urville, J.S.C.: *Philologie, par M. D'Urville, Seconde Partie. Les autres vocabulaires des Langues ou Dialectes océaniens recueillis durant le voyage, et vocabularies*

*compartif des Langues francaises, madekass, malaio, mawi, tonga, taiti et Hawaii, suivis de quelques considerations généralessur ce langues*, Paris 1834.<sup>1</sup>

- Earl, G. W.: *The Eastern Seas: Or Voyages and Adventures in the Indian Archipelago in 1832-33-34*, London 1837. (reprint: OUP Singapore 1971).
- Earl, G.W.: *On the Physical and Arrangement of the Islands of the Indian Archipelago*, JRGS Vol.15 (1845), pp.358-365.
- Earl, G.W.: *Specimens of the dialects of Timor, and of the chain of islands extending them to New Guinea*, JIA, Vol.2 (1848), pp.695-704.
- Earl, G.W.: *On the leading characteristics of the Papuan, Australian, and Malayu-Polynesian Nations*, JIA Vol.4 (1850), pp.1-10 & 66-74 & 172-181.
- Earl, G.W.: *The Native Races of the Indian Archipelago: Papuans*, London 1853.
- Edwards, B.B.: *Obligations of Literature, Particularly of Philology, to Modern Missionary Efforts*, in *The Biblical Repository and Quarterly Observer*, No.XXI (1836), pp.161-186.<sup>2</sup>
- Farrar, F.W.: *Philology as one of the Sciences*, in *MacMillan's Magazine*, Vol.XIX (Nov. 1868-Apr.1869), pp.252-257)
- Ferguson, A.: *An essay on the History of Civil Society*, Dublin 1767.
- Finlayson, G.: *The Mission to Siam and Hué, 1821-1822*. London 1826 (Reprint OUP 1988)
- Forrest, T.: *A Voyage to New Guinea and the Moluccas from Balambangan: Including An Account of Magindanao, Sooloo, and other Islands; and Illustrated with Thirty Copperplates. Performed in the Tartar Galley, belonging to the Honourable East India Company, During the Years 1774, 1775, and 1776*, London 1779.
- Freeman, J.J.: *A Dictionary of the Malagasy Language. In Two Parts. Part I: English and Malagasy*, Antananarivo 1835.
- Gibson, W.M.: *The Prison of Weltevreden and a Glance at the East Indian Archipelago*, New York 1855.
- Granville, A.B.: *The Royal Society in the XIX<sup>th</sup> Century; Being a Statistical Summary of Its Labours During the Last Thirty-Five Years. With Many Original Tables and Official Documents, (Never Before Published) Shewing the Constitution of the Society – the Character of Its Fellows, Its Various Proceedings – and Pecuniary Expenditure, for “Improving Natural Knowledge”; and a Plan for Its Reform*, London 1836.
- Hamilton, A.: *Review of “A Dictionary of the Malay Tongue, as Spoken in the Peninsula of Malacca,...”*, by James Howison, in *The Asiatic Annual Register, or View of the History of*

<sup>1</sup> The first volume on philology was published the year before, whereas a planned third volume was never put to print.

<sup>2</sup> The author of this article was the editor of the journal who at this time was B.B. Edwards.

*Hindustan, and of the Politics, Commerce, and the Literature of Asia*, Vol.III for 1801, 1802, Account of Books, pp.38-42.<sup>1</sup>

- Hamilton, A.: *Review of Asiatic Researches; or Transactions of the Society of instituted in Bengal, for inquiring into the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences and Literature of Asia*, Vol.X, in *Edinburgh Review*, 16:32 (April-Aug 1810), pp.384-398.<sup>2</sup>
- Hervás y Panduro, L.: *Catálogo de las Lenguas de las Naciones Conocidas, Y Numeracion, Division, y Clases de de Estas segun la Diversidad de Sus Idiomas y Dialectos*, 6 vols. Madrid 1800-1805.<sup>3</sup>
- Hodgkin, T.: *Mr. Balbi's Ethnographical Atlas: Classification of Languages*, in *FQR*, Vol.I (1827), pp.377-399.<sup>4</sup>
- Hodgkin, T.: *On the Importance of Studying and Preserving the Languages Spoken by Uncivilized Nations with a View of Elucidating the Physical History of Man* in *The London and Edinburgh Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, (July 1835), Separately printed issue, London 1835.
- Horneman, F.: *The Journal of Frederick Horneman's Travels, from Cairo to Mourzouk, the Capital of the Kingdom of Fezzan, in Africa. In the Years 1797-8*, London 1802.
- Howison, J.: *A Dictionary of the Malay Tongue, as Spoken in the Peninsula of Malacca, Java, Borneo, Pulo Pinang, &c. &c.. In two Parts, English and Malay, and Malay and English, to Which is Prefixed a Grammar of That Language*, London 1801.
- Humboldt, A. von: *Personal narrative of Travels to the Eequinoctial Regions of the New Continent during the Years 1799-1804, by Alexander de Humboldt and Aimé Bonpland; with Maps, Plans, etc., 7 Vols., London 1814-1829.*<sup>5</sup>
- Humboldt, A. von: *Preface* to W. von Humboldt's *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the mental Development of Mankind*, English ed. CUP 1988, Org. in German in 1836 as an Introduction to his "Über die Kawi Sprache".
- Humboldt, W. von: *Über die Kawi-Sprache auf der Insel Java, nebst einer Einleitung über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts*, 3 vols., Berlin 1836, 1838, & 1839.

---

<sup>1</sup> The authorship of this review has been attributed to Hamilton by the expert Rosane Rocher (in *Rocher 1970*, p.444), and I see no reason to contend this assessment.

<sup>2</sup> Authorship positively ascribed to Hamilton by J. Rendall. (*Rendall*, p.53)

<sup>3</sup> An Italian one volume *Catalogo delle Lingue Conosciute e Notizia della Loro Affinita', e Diversita'* was published in Cesana in 1784.

<sup>4</sup> Authorship of this article reviewing A. Balbi's "Atlas Ethnographique du Globe and "Introduction á l' Atlas" (both 1826) has been ascribed to T. Hodgkin in the *Wellesley Index*, Vol.II, p.139..

<sup>5</sup> This edition was translated by the Scottish-Welsh Radical Helen Maria Williams.

- Humboldt, W. von: *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the mental Development of Mankind*, English ed. CUP 1988, Org. published in German in 1836 as an Introduction to his “Über die Kawi Sprache”.
- Hunt, J.: *Annotations and Remarks with a view to Illustrate the Probable Origin of the Dayaks, the Malays, &c*, in *Malayan Miscellanies*, Vol.I (1820), Article 6.<sup>1</sup> (Hunt 1820a)
- Hunt, J.: *Sketch of Borneo or Pulo Kalamantin*, in *Malayan Miscellanies*, Vol.I (1820), Article 8.<sup>2</sup> (Hunt 1820b)
- Hunt, J.: *On the Origin of the Anthropological Review and Its Connection with the Anthropological Society*, in *The Anthropological Review*, Vol.VI (1868), pp.431-442.
- Huxley, T.H.: *Man’s Place in Nature and Other Anthropological Essays*, New York 1899.
- Jones, W.: *Discourses Delivered Before the Asiatic Society: and Miscellaneous Papers, on the Religion, Poetry, Literature, etc., of the Nations of India*, 2 vols., London 1824.
- Kennedy, V.: *Researches into the Origin and Affinity of the Principal Languages of Asia and Europe*, London 1828.
- Klaproth, J.: *Asia Polyglotta*, Paris 1823 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. published in Paris 1831)
- Klaproth, J.: *Notice sur les Nègres de Kuen lun*, in *Journal Asiatique*, Vol.XII (1833), pp.232-243.
- Kolff, D.H.: *Voyages of the Dutch Brig of War Dourga through the Southern and little Known Parts of the Moluccan Archipelago, and along the Previously Unknown Southern Coast of New Guinea, Performed during the Years 1825 & 1826*, London 1840 (Trans. By G.W. Earl).
- Kotzebue, O. von: *Voyage of Discovery into the South Sea and Beering<sup>3</sup> Straits, for the Purpose of Exploring a North-East Passage, Undertaken in the Years 1815-1818, Under the Expense of His Highness the Chancellor of the Empire, Count Romanzoff, in the Ship Rurick, Under the Command of the Lieutenant in the Russian Imperial Navy, Otto von Kotzebue*, 3 Vols., London 1821.
- Lang, J.D.: *View of the Origin and Migrations of the Polynesian Nation; Demonstrating Their Ancient Discovery and Progressive Settlement of the Continent of America*, London 1834.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in *the Asiatic Journal & Monthly Register, for British India and Its Dependencies*, Vol.XII (July-Dec., 1821), pp.29-35 & 117-121.

<sup>2</sup> This publication, printed at the Baptist Mission Press in Bencoolen, had no consecutive pagination. The article was reprinted in 1837 in *Moor*, Appendix, pp.93-109.

<sup>3</sup> Original spelling!

- Lassen, C.: *Indische Alterthumskunde*, 4 Vols. & 1 Appendix, Bonn, Leipzig, & London, 1847-1862.
- Lassen, C. & Klerck, A.W. de (translator and editor): *Lassen's Geschiedenis van den Indischen Archipel*, Utrecht 1862.
- Latham, R.G.: *Upon the Languages of the Papuan or Negrito Race scattered through the Australian and other Asiatic Islands*, in *Proceedings of the Philological Society for 1842-843 and 1843-1844*, (1844)
- Latham, R.G.: *On the Pagan (non-Mahometan) Populations of the Indian Archipelago*, in *TES*, Vol.1 (1861), pp.202-211.
- Leyden, J.: *A Historical & Philosophical Sketch of the Discoveries & Settlements of the Europeans in Northern & Western Africa at the Close of the Eighteenth Century*, Edinburgh 1799.
- Leyden, J.: *Comparative Vocabulary of the Barma, Maláyu, and Tháí Languages*, The Mission Press, Serampore 1810.
- Leyden, J.: *On the Languages and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations*, in *Asiatick Researches*, Vol.X (1811)<sup>1</sup>, pp.158-289.
- Leyden, J.: *Sketch of Borneo, by the Late Dr. Leyden*, in *Transactions of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences*, Vol.VII (1814), Article X.<sup>2</sup>
- Leyden, J.: *The Poetical Remains of the Late Dr. John Leyden, with Memoirs of His Life by the Rev. James Morton*, London 1819.
- Leyden, J.: *Malay Annals: Translated from the Malay Language, by the Late Dr. John Leyden. With and Introduction, by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, F.R.S. &c.&c.*, London 1821.
- Leyden, J.: *Poems and Ballads by Dr. John Leyden: With a Memoir of the Author by Sir Walter Scott, Bart., and Supplement by Robert White*, London 1858.
- Leyden, J. & Murray, H.: *Historical Account of the Discoveries and Travels in Africa, From the Earliest Ages to the Present Time; Including the Substance of the Late Dr. Leyden's Work on That Subject, by Hugh Murray, F.R.S.E.*, 2 Vols., Edinburgh 1817 & 1818.
- Logan, J.R.: *Prospectus of the Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia*, Singapore 1847.

---

<sup>1</sup> Originally read in 1808 and published in *Asiatic Researches*, Vol.X the same year.

<sup>2</sup> The Volume contains no consecutive pagination. The article was reprinted with minor changes in 1837 in *Moor*, Appendix, pp.93-109.



- Logan, J.R.: *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia (JIA)*, Singapore 1847-1863.<sup>1</sup>
- Low, H.: *Sarawak: Its Inhabitants and Productions*, London 1968 (org. London 1848).
- Low, J.: *A Dissertation on the Soil & Agriculture of the British Settlement of Penang*, Singapore 1836.
- Low, J.: *A Translation of the Keddah Annals termed Marong Mahawangsa, and Sketches of the Ancient Condition of some of the Nations of Eastern Asia, with References to the Malays*, in *JIA*, Vol.III (1849), pp.1-23, 162-181, 253-270, 314-336, & 467-488.
- Lyell, C.: *The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, With Remarks on the Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation*, London 1863.
- Mackenzie, C.: *Narrative of a Journey to Examine the remains of an Ancient City and Temples at Brambana in Java*, in *Transactions of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences*, Vol.VII (1814), own pagination, pp.1-53. (Mackenzie 1814)
- Marsden, W.: *Remarks on the Sumatran Languages*, in *Archaeologia: o Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity*, Vol.6 (1782), pp.154-158.
- Marsden, W.: *History of Sumatra*, London 1783.
- Marsden, W.: *History of Sumatra*, London 1784 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- Marsden, W.: *Observation on the Language of the People Commonly Called Gypsies*, in *Archaeologia: or Miscellaneous Tracts Relating to Antiquity*, Vol.7 (1785), pp.382-286. (Marsden 1785a)
- Marsden, W.: *Natürliche und bürgerliche Beschreibung der Insel Sumatra in Ostindien*, Leipzig 1785. (Marsden 1785b)
- Marsden, W.: *Histoire de Sumatra dans laquelle on traite du gouvernement, du commerce, des arts, des loix...*, 2 vols., Paris 1788.
- Marsden, W.: *A Catalogue of Dictionaries, Vocabularies, Grammars, and Alphabets*, London 1796.
- Marsden, W.: *On the Traces of the Hindu Language and Literature, Extant Amongst the Malays*, in *Asiatick Researches*, vol.4 (1798), pp.226-234. (the article org. from 1793)
- Marsden, W.: *History of Sumatra*, 3.ed. London 1811 (1.ed.1783). (reprint: OUP Kuala Lumpur 1966)

---

<sup>1</sup> Apart from being the general editor and publisher of the journal, Logan also contributed with an array of articles throughout the whole period, and it would be too cumbersome to enumerate them all here; instead the title, year, and volume of the journal will appear in the accompanying footnotes to the text.

- Marsden, W.: *A Grammar of the Malayan Language: With an Introduction and Praxis*, London 1812. (Crawfurd 1812a)
- Marsden, W.: *A Dictionary of the Malayan Language*, London 1812.
- Marsden, W.: *Bibliotheca Marsdeniana, Philologica et Orientalis. A catalogue of Books and Manuscripts Collected with a view to the General Comparison of Languages, and to the Study of oriental Literature*, London 1827.
- Marsden, W.: *Miscellaneous Works of William Marsden*, London 1834.
- Marsden, W.: *A Brief Memoir of the Life and Writings of the Late William Marsden, Written by Himself, with Notes from his Correspondence*, London 1838, pp.169-170.
- Martin, R.M.: *British Relations with the Chinese Empire in 1832. Comparative Statement of the English and American Trade with India and Canton*, London 1832. (Martin 1832a)
- Martin; R.M.: *The Past and Present State of the Tea Trade of England, and of the Continents of Europe and America; and a Comparison between the Consumption, Price of, and Revenues Derived from Tea, Coffee, Sugar, Wine, Tobacco, Spirits, &c.*, London 1832. (Martin 1832b)
- Martin; R.M.: *The Political, Commercial, & Financial Condition of the Anglo-Eastern Empire, in 1832; an Analysis of Its Home and Foreign Governments, and a Practical Examination of the Doctrines of Free Trade and Colonization, with Reference to the Renewal or Modification of the Hon. East-India Company's Charter*, London 1832. (Martin 1832c)
- Meinicke, C.E.: *Miscellaneous Works of Will. Marsden*, in *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, Jahrgang 1834, Zweiter Band, column 63-64.
- Mill, J.: *The History of British India*, 3 vols., London 1817.
- Mill, J.S.: Art. 1: *Civilization*, in *The London and Westminster Review*, April-July 1836, pp.1-28.<sup>1</sup>
- Miller, C.: *An Account of the Island of Sumatra*, in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*. Vol.68 (1778), pp.160-179.
- Moor, J.H.(ed.): *Notices of the Indian Archipelago*, London 1968 (org. Singapore 1837).
- Morton, J.: *Memoirs of Dr. Leyden*, pp.i-xcii in *Leyden 1819*.
- Mundy, R.: *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes*, 2 Vols., London 1848.
- Murchison, Sir R.: *Anniversary Address*, in *JRGS Vol.38* (1868), pp.cxxxiii-cxcviii (Crawfurd's obituary on pp.cxlvi-cclii)

---

<sup>1</sup> The authorship of this article is attributed to J.S. Mill in the "The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals" 1824-1900 III (1979, p.584)

- Müller, F. Max: *The last Results of the Researches respecting Non-Iranian and Non-Semitic Languages of Asia and Europe, or the Turanian family of languages*, in *Bunsen 1854*, Vol.III, pp.263-486.
- Müller, F. Max: *The Languages of the Seat of War in the East, with a Survey of the Three Families of Language, Semitic, Arian, and Turanian*, London 1855 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).<sup>1</sup>
- Müller, F. Max: *Lectures in the Science of Language, Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain*, 2 vols., London 1861 & 1864.
- Newbold, T.J.: *A Political and Statistical Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca*, (2 vols.) London 1839.
- Nott, J.C. & Gliddon, G.R. (eds.): *Types of Mankind; or, Ethnological Researches, Based upon Ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races, and upon Their Natural Geographical, and Biblical History*, Philadelphia 1854.
- Nott, J.C. & Gliddon, G.R. (eds.): *Indigenous Races of the Earth; New Chapters of Ethnological Inquiry; Including Monographs of Special Departments of Philology, Iconography, Cranioscopy, Palæontology, Pathology, Archæology, Comparative Geography, and Natural History*, London & Philadelphia 1857.
- Ocharik, Desh-U-Lubun: *Letter to the Author of a "View of the Present State and Future Prospects of the Free Trade and Colonization of India;" Or, A Plain and Practical Review of the Above Important Subjects*, London 1830.
- Perry, Sir E.: *On the conflicting views of European Scholars as to the Races inhabiting Polynesia, and the Indian Archipelago; and as to the Languages spoken by them*, in *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol.IV, No.XVI, pp.242-260.
- Petersen, N.M.: *Fortale: Bidrag til Forfatterens Levnet*, in *Rask 1834-1838*, Vol.I, pp.1-115.<sup>2</sup>
- Pinkerton, J.: *Modern Geography. A description of the Empires, Kingdoms, States, and Colonies; With the Oceans, Seas, and Isles; In all Parts of the World: Including the Most Recent Discoveries, and Political Alterations*, 2 Vols., London 1804.
- Potocki, J.: *Viaje al imperio de China*, Laertes 1998.
- Prichard, J.C.: *Researches into the Physical History of Man*, university of Chicago Press 1973 (org. 1813).

---

<sup>1</sup> The 1<sup>st</sup>. edition was published the year before, in 1854.

<sup>2</sup> "Introduction: Contribution to the Life of the Author"; N.K. Petersen was Rasmus Rask's childhood friend and fellow philologist.

- Prichard, J.C.: *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, 2 vols., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London 1826.
- Prichard, J.C.: *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, 5 vols., 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., London 1836-1847.
- Prichard, J.C.: *The Natural History of Man: Comprising Inquiries into the Modifying Influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the Different Tribes of the Human Family*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., London 1843.
- Prichard, J.C.: *The Natural History of Man: Comprising Inquiries into the Modifying Influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the Different Tribes of the Human Family*, 2<sup>nd</sup> enlarged ed., London 1845.
- Prichard, J.C.: *The Natural History of Man: Comprising Inquiries into the Modifying Influence of Physical and Moral Agencies on the Different Tribes of the Human Family*, 3<sup>rd</sup> enlarged ed., London 1848.
- Raffles, S.(ed.): *Memoir of the Life and Public Services of Sir Thomas Raffles... By His Widow*, 2 Vols. London 1835 (2<sup>nd</sup>. edition. The 1<sup>st</sup> edition was published in 1830).
- Raffles, Sir T.S.: *Substance of a Minute Recorded by the Honourable Thomas Stamford Raffles on the 11<sup>th</sup> February 1814; on the Introduction of an Improved System of Internal Management and the Establishment of a Land Rental on the Island of Cuba*, London 1814.
- Raffles, Sir T.S.: *A Discourse*, in *Transactions of the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences*, Vol.VIII (1816), own pagination, pp.1-95.
- Raffles, Sir T. S.: *History of Java*, 2 Vols., London 1817. (reprint: OUP Kuala Lumpur 1965)
- Raffles, Sir T.S.: *On the Maláyu Nation, with a Translation of its maritime Institutions*, in *Asiatick Researches*, Vol.XII, 1818, pp.102-159.
- Raffles, Sir T.S.: *Introduction to J. Leyden's Malay Annals*, in *Leyden 1821*, pp.v-xvi.
- Raffles, Sir T.S.: *Introduction to G. Finlayson's Mission to Siam and Hué, 1821-1822*, London 1826. (Reprinted 1988)
- Raffles, Sir T.S. & Barrow, Sir J.: *Review of "History of the Indian Archipelago"*, in *Quarterly Review*, Vol.XXVIII, No.55 (Oct.1822-Jan.1823), pp.111-138.
- Rask, R.: *Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske, eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse*, København 1818.

- Rask, H.K.: *Samlede, Tildels Forhen Utrykte Afhandlinger af R.K. Rask. Udgivne efter Forfatterens Død af H.K. Rask*, 3 vols. København 1834-1838.<sup>1</sup>
- St. John, H.: *The Indian Archipelago: Its History and Present State*, (2 vols.) London 1853 (Reprint 1969).
- St. John, S.: *Piracy in the Indian Archipelago*, in JIA, Vol.III (1849), pp.251-260.
- St. John, S.: *The Life of Sir James Brooke*, OUP Singapore 1994 (org. 1879)
- Scott, Sir W.: *Biographical Memoir of John Leyden, M.D.*, in *Leyden 1858*, pp.1-71.<sup>2</sup>
- Shebbeare, J.: *The History of the Excellence and Decline of the Constitution, Religion, Laws, Manners and Genius of the Sumatrans. And of the Restoration thereof in the Reign of Amurath the Third*, 2 Vols., London 1760.
- Smith, A.: *The Theory of Moral Sentiments, to Which is Added a Dissertation on the Origin of Languages*, London 1767 (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition).<sup>3</sup>
- Smith, A.: *Essays on Philosophical Subjects, by the Late Adam Smith*, Dublin 1795.
- Spiegel, Dr.: *Bibliographische Anzeigen. Indische Journale*, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Vol.3 (1849), pp.468-472.
- Stewart, D.: *Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith*, in Smith 1795.
- Stockdale, J.J.: *Sketches, Civil and Military, of the Island of Java and Its Immediate Dependencies: Comprising Interesting Details of Batavia, and Authentic Particulars of the Celebrated Poison-Tree*, London 1811. (Reprinted in Hong Kong 1995)
- Stoddart, Sir J.: *Glossology; Or the Historical Relations of Languages. First Division*, London and Glasgow 1858.
- Thomsen, C.H.: *A Vocabulary of the English, Bugis, and Malay Languages, Containing about 2000 Words*, The Mission Press Singapore 1833.
- Thorn, W.: *Memoir of the Conquest of Java; with the Subsequent Operations of the British Forces, in the Oriental Archipelago. To Which is Subjoined, a Statistical and Historical Sketch of Java; being the Result of Observations Made in a Tour through the Country; with an Account of Its Dependencies*, London 1815. (Reprinted in Hong Kong 2004)
- Tuckey, J.K.: *Narrative off an Expedition to Explore the River Zaire, Usually Called the Congo, in South Africa, in 1816, Under the Direction of Captain J.K. Tuckey, R.N....*, London 1818.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Collected, Partially Previously Unpublished Dissertations by R.K. Rask. Published after the Author's Demise by H.K. Rask" (who was his younger brother).

<sup>2</sup> Originally published in *Edinburgh Annual Register*, Vol.IV (1811), pp.xli-lxviii.

<sup>3</sup> This dissertation was first published as an appendix to this 3<sup>rd</sup> edition and was not included in neither the 1<sup>st</sup> nor the 2<sup>nd</sup> editions. (Berry, p.130, and Land, p.677)

- Wallace, A.R.: *The Origin of Human races and the Antiquity of Man deduced from the Theory of "Natural Selection"*, in JAS, Vol.2 (1864), pp.clviii-clxxxvii.
- Wallace, A.R.: *On the Varieties of Man in the Malay Archipelago*, in TES, Vol.3 (1865), pp.196-215.
- Wallace, A.R.: *On the Progress of Civilization in Northern Celebes*, in TES, Vol.4 (1866), pp.61-70.
- Wallace, A.R.: *The Malay Archipelago*, OUP 1986 (org. 1869) (Wallace 1869).
- White, R.: *Supplement to Sir Walter Scott's Biographical Memoir of John Leyden, M.D.*, in *Leyden 1858*, pp.73-99.
- Wilford, F.: *An Essay on the Sacred Isles in the West, with other Essays connected with that Work*, in *Asiatick Researches*, Vol.X, 1811, pp.27-157 & Vol.XI, 1812, pp.11-152.
- Wilson, D.: *Prehistoric Man. Researches into the History of Civilization in the Old and New World*, 2 vols., London 1862.
- Wilson, H.H.: *Mackenzie Collection: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental Manuscripts, and Other Articles Illustrative of the Literature, History, Statistics, and Antiquities of the South of India; Collected by the Late Lieut.—Col. Colin Mackenzie, Surveyor General of India*, 2 Vols., Calcutta 1828.
- Young, T.: *Review of "Mithridates, oder Allgemeine Sprachenkunde"*, in *Quarterly Review*, Vol.X, No.19, (Oct.1813-Jan.1814), pp.250-292.

### **Later Literature.**

- Aarsleff, H.: *The History of Linguistics and Professor Chomsky*, in *Language*, 46:3 (Sep. 1970), pp.570-585.
- Aarsleff, H.: *From Locke to Saussure: Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History*, University of Minnesota Press 1982.
- Aarsleff, H.: *The Study of Language in England, 1780-1860*, 2.ed. University of Minnesota Press 1983 (org.1966).
- Aarsleff, H.: *Introduction*, in W. Von Humboldt's *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the mental Development of Mankind*, CUP 1988, pp.vii-lxv.
- Adams, P.G.: *Travelers and Travel Liars, 1660-1800*, 2.ed. New York 1980 (Org. 1962).
- Adams, P.G.: *Travel Literature and the Evolution of the Novel*, the University Press of Kentucky, 1983.

- Adas, M.: *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance*, Cornell University Press 1989.
- Alatas, S.H.: *The Myth of the Lazy Native: A study of the image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century and its function in the ideology of colonial capitalism*, London 1977.
- Aljunied, S.M.K.: *From Noble Muslims to Saracen Enemies: Thomas Stamford Raffles' Discourse on Islam in the Malay World*, in "Sari", 21 (2003), pp.13-29.
- Aljunied, S.M.K.: *Rethinking Raffles: A Study of Stamford Raffles' Discourse on Religions Amongst Malays*, Singapore 2005.
- Allen, C.: *The Buddha and the Sahibs: The men who discovered India's lost Religion*, London 2002.
- Alter, S.G.: *Darwinism and the Linguistic Image: Language, Race and Natural Theology in the Nineteenth Century*, Johns Hopkins University Press 1999.
- Alter, S.G.: *William Dwight Whitney and the Science of Language*, Johns Hopkins Press 2005.
- Amigoni, D.: *Colonies, Cults and Evolution: Literature, Science and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Writing*, CUP 2007.
- Andaya, L.Y.: *Leaves of the Same Tree: Trade and Ethnicity in the Straits of Melaka*, University of Hawai'i Press 2008.
- Armitage, D.: *Theories of empire, 1450-1800*, Ashgate 1998,
- Armitage, D.: *The ideological origins of the British Empire*, CUP 2000
- Armitage, D. & Subrahmanyam, S. (eds.): *The Age of Revolutions in Global Context, c.1760-1840*, New York 2010.
- Arnold, D.: *The Problem of Nature: Environment, Culture and European Expansion*, Oxford 1996.
- Arnold, D.: *Race, Place and Bodily Difference in Early Nineteenth-Century India*, in *Historical Research* 77 (2004), pp. 254–273.
- Arnold, D.: *The Tropics and the Traveling gaze: India, landscape, and Science, 1800-1856*, Delhi 2005.
- Arnold, D.: *Plant capitalism and Company Science: The Indian Career of Nathaniel Wallich*, in *Modern Asian Studies*, 2007, pp.1-30 (The article has not yet been published in any Issue of MAS, but it is available from in their online version)
- Augstein, H.F.: *James Cowles Prichard's Anthropology: Remaking the Science of Man in Early Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 1999.

- Baker, D.W.A.: Lang, John Dunmore, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Ballantyne, T.: *Archive, Discipline, State: Power and Knowledge in South Asian Historiography*, in *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 3:1 (Jun 2001), pp.87-105.
- Ballantyne, T.: *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism and the British Empire*, London 2002.
- Ballantyne, T. (ed.): *Science, Empire, and the European Exploration of the Pacific*, Ashgate 2004.
- Ballantyne, T.: *the 'Oriental Renaissance' in the Pacific: Orientalism, language, and Ethnogenesis in the Pacific*, in *Ballantyne 2004*, pp....
- Ballantyne, T.: *Colonial Knowledge*, in *Stockwell*, pp.177-197.
- Ballard, C.: *'Oceanic Negroes': British Anthropology of Papuans, 1820-1869*, in Douglas & Ballard.
- Banerjee, A.C.: *The Eastern Frontier of British India, 1784-1824*, 4. ed. Calcutta 1986 (1. ed. from 1943).
- Barker, J.: *Where the Missionary Frontier Ran Ahead of Empire*, in *Etherington*, pp.86-106.
- Barker, G.F.R. & Prior, K.: *Perry, Sir Thomas Erskine*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Barley, N. (ed.): *The Golden Sword: Stamford Raffles and the East*, the British Museum 1999.
- Barnard, A.: *History and Theory in Anthropology*, CUP 2000.
- Barnard, A.(ed.): *Hunter-Gatherers in History, Archaeology and Anthropology*, Oxford & New York 2004.
- Barnard, A.: *Hunting-and-Gathering Society: an Eighteenth-Century Scottish Invention*, in *Barnard 2004*, pp.31-43.
- Bastin, J.: *Sir Stamford Raffles's and John Crawfurd's Ideas of Colonizing the Malay Archipelago*, in *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XXVI, Pt.1, 1953, pp.81-85.
- Bastin, J.: *Raffles and British Policy in the Indian Archipelago, 1811-1816*, in *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XXVII, Pt.I, 1954, pp.84-119. (*Bastin 1954a*)
- Bastin, J.: *Raffles' Ideas on the Land Rent System in Java*, 's-Gravenhage 1954- (*Bastin 1954b*)
- Bastin, J.: *Crawfurd and Baud on Free and Forced Labour in Java*, in *JMBRAS* Vol.XXIX, Pt.1, 1956, pp.195-199.



- Bastin, J.: *The Native Policies of Sir Stamford Raffles in Java and Sumatra: An Economic Interpretation*, OUP 1957.
- Bastin, J.: *English Sources for the Modern Period of Indonesian History*, in “Soedjatmoko, Ali, Resink & Kahin“, pp.252-71. (Bastin 1965a)
- Bastin, J.: *Foreword* to the republication of T.S. Raffles’s *History of Java*, OUP Kuala Lumpur 1965. (Bastin 1965b)
- Bastin, J.: *Introduction* to A.R. Wallace’s *The Malay Archipelago*, OUP 1986.
- Bastin, J.: *Introduction* to Stockdale’s *Island of Java*, Hong Kong 1995.
- Bastin, J.: *Introduction* to Thorn’s *The Conquest of Java*, Hong Kong 2004.
- Bastin, J. & Rohatgi, P.: *Prints of Southeast Asia in the India Office Library*, London 1979.
- Battersby, P.: *To the Islands: White Australians and the Malay Archipelago since 1788*, Lexington Books 2007.
- Bayly, C.A. & Kolff, D.H.A. (eds.): *Two Colonial Empires: Comparative Essays on the History of India and Indonesia*, Leiden University Press 1986.
- Bayly, C.A.: *Two Colonial Revolts: The Java War, 1825-30, and the Indian ‘Mutiny’ of 1857-59*, Bayly & Kolff, pp.111-136.
- Bayly, C.A.: *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830*, London 1989.
- Bayly, C.A.: *Empire & Information: Intelligence gathering and social communication in India, 1780-1870*, CUP 1996.
- Bayly, C.A.: *Recovering Liberties: Indian Thought in the Age of Liberalism and Empire*, CUP 2012.
- Bell, D. (ed.): *Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth-Century Political Thought*, CUP 2007.
- Beer, G.: *Open Fields: Science in Cultural Encounter*, OUP 1996.
- Beer, J.: *Coleridge, Samuel Taylor*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Bellwood, P.; Fox, J.J.; & Tryon, D. (eds.): *The Austronesians: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, Australian National University Press 2006 (orig. 1995).
- Benes, T.: *Comparative Linguistics as Ethnology: In Search of Indo-Germans in Central Asia, 1770-1830*, in *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East*, 24:2 (2004), pp.117-132.
- Benes, T.: *From Indo-Germans to Aryans: Philology and the Racialization of Salvationist National Rhetoric, 1806-1830*, in *Eigen & Larrimore*, pp.167-181. (Benes 2006)

- Benes, T.: *In Babel's Shadow: Language, Philology, and the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Germany*, Wayne State University Press 2008.
- Bennett, B.M. & Hodge, J.M. (eds.): *Science and Empire: Knowledge and Networks of Science across the British Empire, 1800-1970*, New York 2011.
- Berry, C.J.: *Adam Smith's Considerations on Language*, in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol.35, No.1 (Jan.-Mar. 1974), pp.130-138.
- Bingle, R.J.: *Henry Yule: India and Cathay*, in *Bridges and Hair*, pp.143-163.
- Bintliff, J. (ed.): *A Companion to Archaeology*, London 2004.
- Blagden, C.O.: *Catalogue of Manuscripts in European Languages belonging to the Library of the India Office: The Mackenzie Collections ; Vol.I, the 1822 collection and the private collection*, OUP 1916.
- Blench, R.: *Archaeology and Language: Methods and Issues*, in Bintliff, pp.52-74.
- Blussé, L.: *Changes of the Regime and Colonial State Formation in the Malay Archipelago, 1780-1830: an invitation to an international research project*, in Asia Research Institute: *Working Papers Series*, No.41 (2005), Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore.
- Boase, G.C. & Banerji, N.: *Stoddart, Sir John*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Bodelsen, C.A.: *Studies in Mid-Victorian Imperialism*, København (Copenhagen) and London 1924.
- Boon, J.: *The Birth of the idea of Bali*, in *Indonesia*, 22 (1976), pp.71-84.
- Boon, J.: *Affinities and Extremes. Crisscrossing the Bittersweet Ethnology of East Indies History, Hindu-Balinese Culture, and Indo-European Allure*, Chicago 1990.
- Bosma, U.: *The Cultivation System (1830-1870) and its private entrepreneurs on Colonial Java*, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 38 (2), pp.275-291 (June 2007).
- Bowden, B.: *The Empire of Civilization: the Evolution of an Imperial Idea*, University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Bowden, B & Seabrooke, L. (eds.): *Global Standards of Market Civilization*, London & New York 2006.
- Bowring, Sir J.: *Autobiographical Recollections of Sir John Browning. With a Brief Memoir by Lewin B. Browning*, London 1877.
- Boxer, C.R.: *The Dutch Seaborne Empire 1600-1800*, London 1990. (Org. 1965)
- Brantlinger, P.: *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*, Cornell University Press 1988.

- Brantlinger, P.: *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800-1930*, Cornell University Press 2003.
- Brantlinger, P.: *Victorian Literature and Postcolonial Studies*, Edinburgh University Press 2009.
- Breckenridge, C.A. & Veer, P. Van der (eds.): *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.
- Bredal, B.: *Manden der ville vise verden: Malthe Conrad Bruun & Malte-Brun*, København 2011.
- Brettel, C.B.: *Introduction: Travel Literature, Ethnography, and Ethnohistory*, in *Ethnohistory*, Vol.33, No.2 (Spring 1986), pp.127-138.
- Bрева-Claramonte, M.: *The European Linguistic Tradition and Early Missionary Grammars in Central and South America*, in Kibbee, pp.236-251.
- Bridges, R.C. & Hair, P.E.H. (eds.): *Compassing the Vaste Globe of the Earth: Studies in the History of the Hakluyt Society*, The Hakluyt Society, London 1996.
- Brock, P.: *New Christian as Evangelists*, in *Etherington*, pp.132-152.
- Burgess, G. & Festenstein, M. (eds.): *English Radicalism, 1550-1850*, CUP 2007.
- Burke, P.: *Language and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, CUP 2004.
- Burke, P. & Porter, R. (eds.): *Language, Self, and Society: A Social History of Language*, Polity Press 1991.
- Burrow, J.: *Evolution and Anthropology in the 1860's: The Anthropological Society of London, 1863-1871*, in *Victorian Studies* 7:2 (1963), pp.137-154.
- Burrow, J.: *Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory*, CUP 1966.
- Burrow, J.: *The Uses of Philology in Victorian England*. In Robson 1967, pp.180-204.
- Cameron, J.M.R.: *Barrow, Sir John*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Campbell, L. & Poser, W.J.: *Language Classification: History and Method*, CUP 2008.
- Cantor, G.: *Quakers, Jews, and Science: Religious Responses to Modernity and the Sciences in Britain, 1650-1900*, OUP 2005.
- Carey, H.M.: *God's Empire: Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c.1801-1908*, CUP 2011.
- Carey, P.: *The Residency Archive of Jogjakarta, in Indonesia*, Vol.25 (1978), ppp.115-150.
- Carey, P.: *A New Acquisition for the Library of the Koninklijk Instituut: Transliterated Copies of the John Crawford Collection of Javanese Reports, Original Letters and Land Grants from the Yogyakarta Court (1772-1812)*, in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 135 (1979), No.2/3, Leiden, pp.354-357.

- Carey, P.: *The Power of Prophecy: Prince Dipanagara and the End of an Old Order in Java, 1785-1855*, Leyden 2008.
- Carey, P.: *Revolutionary Europe and the Destruction of Java's Old Order, 1808-1830*, in *Armitage & Subrahmanyam*, pp.167-188. (Carey 2010)
- Carhart, M.C.: *Polynesia and polygenism: the scientific use of travel literature in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century*, in *History of the Human Sciences*, 22:58 (2009), pp.58-86.
- Carroll, D.: *Savages and Barbarians: The British Enlightenment and William Marsden's contribution to a Malayo-Polynesian Discourse*, published in the internet based journal *Signatures*, Vol.5, 2002. See: [www.ucc.ac.uk/signatures/assets/pdf/Signatures\\_Vol5.pdf](http://www.ucc.ac.uk/signatures/assets/pdf/Signatures_Vol5.pdf)
- Carroll, D.: *William Marsden and Patterns of British Scholarship in the Malay Peninsula*, in *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 39:114 (2011), pp.269-294.
- Chatterjee, P.: *The Black Hole of Empire: History of a Global Practice of Power*, Princeton University Press 2012.
- Chaudhuri, K.N.: *The Economic Development of India under the East India Company 1814-1858*, CUP 1971.
- Chia, J.Y.J.: *James Richardson Logan*, an article published on *singaporeinfopedia*. See: [http://infopedia.nl.sg/articles/SIP\\_1146\\_2009-10-27.html](http://infopedia.nl.sg/articles/SIP_1146_2009-10-27.html)
- Clark, S. & Smethurst, P. (eds.): *Asian Crossings: Travel Writing on China, Japan and Southeast Asia*, Hong Kong UP 2008.
- Clifford, H.: *At the Court of Pelesu and Other Stories*, OUP (Kuala Lumpur) 1993.
- Clifford, J.: *On Ethnographic Authority*, in *Representations*, 2 (Spring 1983), pp.118-146.
- Cohn, B.S.: *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*, Princeton University Press 1996.
- Cohn, B.S.: *The Past in the Present: India as Museum of Mankind*, in *History and Anthropology*, 1998, Vol.11, No.1, pp.1-38.
- Collet, S.D. & Sarkar, H.C. (ed.): *The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy. Compiled and Edited by the Late Sophia Dobson Collet and Completed by a Friend. Second Edition; Edited by Hem Chandra Sarkar, M.A., Calcutta 1914.*
- Colley, L.: *Britishness and Otherness: An Argument*, in *The Journal of British Studies*, 31:4 (Oct. 1992), pp.309-329.
- Collin, F. & Guldmann, F.: *Sprogfilosofi: En Introduktion*, København 1998. (*Philosophy of Language: An Introduction*)
- Collini, S.; Winch, D.; Burrow, J.: *That Noble Science of Politics: A study in nineteenth-century intellectual history*, CUP 1983.

- Conrad, S. & Sachsenmaier, D. (eds.): *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Markets and Movements, 1880s -1930s*, New York 2007.
- Conrad, S. & Sachsenmaier, D.: *Introduction: Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s-1930s*, in Conrad & Sachsenmaier, pp.1-25.
- Coolhaas, W. Ph.: *Dutch Contributions to the Historiography of Colonial Activity in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, in Hall, D.G.E. (ed.): *Historians of South East Asia*, London 1961, pp.224-234.
- Cook, A.S.: *Marsden, William*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Cook, J.A. Bethune: *Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, Kt., LL.D., F.R.S., Founder of Singapore, 1819, and Some of his Friends and Contemporaries*, London 1918.
- Cooper, F & Stoler, A.L. (eds.): *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, University of California Press 1997.
- Coupland, R.: *Raffles, 178-1826*, OUP 1934. (Org. published in 1926)
- Cowan, C.D.: *Ideas of History in the Journal of the Malayan (Straits) Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1878-1941*, in Hall, pp.279-285.
- Cust, R.N.: *A Sketch of the Modern Languages of the East Indies*. London 1878.
- Davies, A.M.: *History of Linguistics. Volume IV: Nineteenth-Century Linguistics*, London 1998.
- Delburgo, J. & Dew, N.(eds.): *Science Empire in the Atlantic World*, New York 2008.
- Demata, M.: *Prejudiced Knowledge: Travel Literature in the Edinburgh Review*, in Demata & Wu, p.82-101.
- Demata, M. & Wu, D. (eds.): *British Romanticism and the Edinburgh Review: Bicentenary Essays*, New York 2002.
- Deventer, M.L. van: *Daendels – Raffles: A Dissertation on the Two Celebrated Governors of Java, During One of the Most Important Periods in the History of the Dutch Colonies in the East Indies*, London 1894. (Translation from Dutch by G.G. Batten)
- Diaz-Andreu, M.: *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*, OUP 2007.
- Dirks, N.B.: *Colonial Histories and Native Informants: Biography of an Archive*, in Breckenridge & Veer: *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993, pp.279-313.
- Dirks, N.B.: *Foreword*, in “Cohn, 1996”, pp.ix-xvii.
- Dirks, N.B.: *Colin Mackenzie: Autobiography of an Archive*, in Trautmann 2009b, pp.29-47.

- Douglas, B.: *Seaborne Ethnography and the Natural History of Man*, in *Journal of Pacific History*, 38:1 (2003), pp.3-27.
- Douglas, B.: *Notes on 'Race' and the Biologisation of Human Difference*, in *Journal of Pacific History*, 40:3 (2005), pp.331-338.
- Douglas, B.: *Slippery Word, Ambiguous Praxis: 'Race' and late-18<sup>th</sup>-century in Oceania*, in *Journal of Pacific History*, 41:1 (2006), pp.1-29.
- Douglas, B.: *Terra Australis to Oceania: Racial Geography in the 'Fifth Part of the World'*, in *Journal of Pacific History*, 45:2 (2010), pp.179-210.
- Douglas, B. & Ballard, C. (eds.): *Foreign Bodies: Oceania and the Science of Race 1750-1940*, Australian National University 2008.
- Dowling, L.: *Victorian Oxford and the Science of Language*, in *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, 97:2 (1982), pp.160-178.
- Driem, G. van: *Hodgson's Tibeto-Burman and Tibeto-Burman Today*, in *Waterhouse*, pp.227-248.
- Driver, F.: *Geography Militant: Cultures of Exploration and Empire*, London 2001.
- Ebbesen, K.: *The Origins of the Indo-European Languages/De indoeuropæiske sprogs oprindelse*, København 2009.
- Echols, J.M.: *Presidential Address: Dictionaries and Dictionary Making: Malay and Indonesian*, in *Journal of Asian Studies*, 38:1 (1978), pp.11-24.
- Eco, U.: *The Search for the Perfect Language*, London 1995 (Org. published in Italian in 1994).
- Eco, U.: *Serendipities: Language and Lunacy*, Columbia University Press 1998.
- Edney, M.: *Mapping an Empire: The Geographical Construction of British India, 1765-1843*, OUP 1999 (org. 1997).
- Egerton, H.E.: *Sir Stamford Raffles: England in the Far East*, New York 1900.
- Eigen, S. & Larrimore, M.(eds.): *The German Invention of Race*, State University of New York Press 2006.
- Eley, G.: *Imperial Imaginary, Colonial Effect: Writing the Colony and the Metrople Together*, in *Hall & McClelland*, pp.217-236.
- Ellingson, T.: *The Myth of the Noble Savage*, Berkeley 2001.
- Emmerson, D.K.: "Southeast Asia": What's in a Name? in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 15 (1984), pp.1-21.
- Erlandson, J.M.: *Ancient Immigrants: Archaeology and Maritime Migrations*, in *Lucassen, Lucassen, & Manning*, pp.191-214.

- Errington, J.: *Colonial Linguistics*, in *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30 (2001), pp.19-39.
- Errington, J.: *Linguistics in a Colonial World: A Story of Language, Meaning, and Power*, Blackwell 2008.
- Etherington, N.(ed.): *Missions and Empire*, OUP 2005.
- Fabian, J.: *Time and the Other: how anthropology makes its object*, Columbia University Press 2002 (org. 1983).
- Fagan, L.: *The reform Club: Its Founders and Architect*, London 1883.
- Firth, R.: *Engagement and Detachment: Reflections on Applying Social Anthropology to Social Affairs*, in *The Dynamics of Applied Anthropology in the Twentieth Century: The Malinowski Award Papers*, Society for Applied Anthropology, Oklahoma City 2002, pp.153-158.<sup>1</sup>
- Fleming, F.: *Barrow's Boys* London 1998.
- Forge, A.: *Raffles and Daniell: Making the Image Fit*, in Gerstle & Milner.
- Foster, J.R.: *Smollett and the Atom*, in *PMLA*, 68:5 (1953), pp.1032-1046.
- Foucault, M.: *Ordene og Tingene (The Order of the Things)*, København 1999 (org. in French 1966).
- Fry, H.T.: *Alexander Dalrymple and the expansion of British Trade*, University of Toronto Press 1970.
- Fulford, T. & Kitson, P.J. (eds.): *Travels, Explorations and Empires: Writings from the Era of Imperial Expansion, 1770-1835, Vol. 2, Southeast Asia*, London 2001.
- Gaenszle, M.: *Brian Hodgson as Ethnographer and Ethnologist*, in *Waterhouse*, pp.2206-226.
- Galton, F.: *Memoirs of My Life*, London 1908.
- Gascoigne, J.: *Joseph Banks and the English Enlightenment: Useful Knowledge and Polite Culture*, CUP 1994.
- Gascoigne, J.: *Science in the Service of Empire: Joseph Banks, the British State and the Uses of Science in the Age of Revolution*, CUP 1998.
- Gascoigne, J.: *Science and the British Empire from its Beginnings to 1850*, in *Bennet & Hodge*, pp.47-67. (Gascoigne 2011)
- Gelpke, J.S.: *On the Origin of the Name Papua*, in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 149:2 (1993), pp.318-332.

---

<sup>1</sup> Firth's article is originally from 1981.

- Gerstle, A. & Milner, A. (eds.): *Recovering the Orient: Artists, scholars, appropriations*, Singapore 1994.
- Gibson-Hill, C.A.: *The Singapore Chronicle (1824-1837)*, in JMBRAS, 26 (1953), pp.175-199.
- Gibson-Hill, C.A.: *George Windsor Earl*, in JMBRAS, 32 (1959), pp.105-133.
- Gieryn, T.F.: *Three Truth Spots*, in *Journal of History of the Behavioral Science*, 38:2 (2002), pp.113-132.
- Glacken, C.J.: *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century*, London 1967.
- Glyn, L.B.: *Israel Lyons: a Short, but Starry Career. The Life of an Eighteenth-Century Jewish Botanist and Astronomer*, in *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 56 (2002), pp.275-305.
- Goh, D.P.S.: *Imperialism and 'Medieval' Natives: The Malay image in Anglo-American travelogues and Colonialism in Malaya and the Philippines*, in *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol.10 (3), (2007), pp.323-341.
- Gondermann, T.: *Die Etablierung der Evolutionslehre in der Viktorianischen Anthropologie: Die Wissenschaftspolitik des X-Clubs, 1860-1872*, in *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Wissenschaften, Technik und Medizin*, 16:3 (2008), pp.309-331.
- Goodman, J.: *Making Imperial Space: Settlement, Surveying, and Trade in Northern Australia in the Nineteenth Century*, in *Killingray, Lincoln, & Rigby*, pp.128-141.
- Goodson, A.C.: *Coleridge on Language: A Poetic Paradigm*, in *Philological Quarterly*, 62:1 (1983), pp.45-68.
- Goody, J.: *The Theft of History*, CUP 2006.
- Gould, S.J.: *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle: Myth and Metaphor in the Discovery of Geological Time*, Harvard University Press 1987.
- Graaf, H.J. de: *Aspects of Dutch Historical Writings on Colonial Activities in South East Asia with Special Reference to the Indigenous Peoples During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, in *Hall*, pp.213-224.
- Grafton, A.: *Chronology and Its Discontents in Renaissance Europe: The Vicissitudes of a Tradition*, in *Hughes and Trautmann*.
- Grafton, A.: *The Footnote: A curious history*, Harvard University Press 1997.
- Graham, G.S.: *Great Britain in the Indian Ocean: A Study of Maritime Enterprise 1810-1850*, OUP 1967.



- Gray, E.G. & Fiering, N. (eds.): *The Language Encounter in the Americas, 1492-1800: A Collection of Essays*, Berghahn Books 2000.
- Greenbderg, M.: *British Trade and the Opening of China 1800-42*, CUP 1951.
- Gregorio, M.A. Di: *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Naturalist: Ernst Haeckel, Wilhelm Bleek, Friedrich Müller, and the Meaning of Language*, in *Journal of the History of Biology*, 35 (2002), pp.79-109.
- Griggs, T.: *Universal History from Counter-Reformation to Enlightenment*, in *Modern Intellectual History*, 4, 2 (2007), pp.219-247.
- Grijns, C.: *Van der Tuuk and the Study of Malay*, in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 152:3 (1996), pp.353-381.
- Groot, H.: *Van Batavia naar Weltevreden: Het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 1778-1867*, Leiden 2009.
- Gyrus: *War and the Noble Savage, Being a Critical Account into Recent Accounts of Violence amongst Uncivilized People*, London 2009.
- Haddon, A.C.: *The Outriggers of Indonesian Canoes*, in *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 50:1 (1920), pp.69-134.
- Hägerdal, H. (ed.): *Responding to the West: Essays on Colonial Domination and Asian Agency*, Amsterdam University Press 2009.
- Hahn, E.: *Raffles of Singapore: A Biography*, New York 1946.
- Hall, C. & McClelland, K. (eds.): *Race, Nation, and Empire: Making Histories, 1750 to the Present*, Manchester University Press 2010.
- Hall, C.: *Civilising Subjects: Colony and the Metropole in the English Imagination*, University of Chicago Press 2002.
- Hall, D.G.E. (ed.): *Historians of South East Asia*, London 1961.
- Haller, J.S.: *Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority 1859-1900*, University of Illinois Press 1971.
- Hampson, R.: *Cross-Cultural Encounters in Joseph Conrad's Malay Fiction*, London 2000.
- Handler, R.: *Raymond Williams, George Stocking, and Fin-de-Siècle US Anthropology*, in *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol.13, No.4 (Nov. 1998), pp.447-463.
- Hargraves, N.: *Beyond the Savage Character: Mexicans, Peruvians, and the "Imperfectly Civilized" in William Robertson's "History of America"*, in Wolff & Cipolloni, pp.103-118.
- Harpham, G.G.: *Roots, Races, and the Return to Philology*, in *Representations* 106 (Spring 2009), pp.34-62.

- Harris, R., & Taylor, T.J.: *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought: The Western Tradition from Socrates to Saussure*, 2<sup>nd</sup>, revised edition, London 1997.
- Harrison, B.: *English Historians of 'the Indian Archipelago': Crawford and St. John*, in "Hall", pp.245-54.
- Heartfield, J.: *The Aborigines' protection Society: Humanitarian Imperialism in Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, Canada, South Africa, and the Congo, 1836-1909*, London 2011.
- Henze, B.: *Scientific Definition in Rhetorical Formations: Race as "Permanent Variety" in James Cowles Prichard's Ethnology*, in *Rhetoric Review*, 23:4 (2004), pp.311-331.
- Higgitt, R. & Withers, C.W.J.: *Science and Sociability: Women as Audience at the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1831-1901*, in *Isis*, 99:1 (2008), pp.1-27.
- Hillemann, U.: *Asian Empire and British Knowledge: China and the Networks of British Imperial Expansion*, Palgrave 2009.
- Hjelmslev, L.: *Sproget: Sproglægtskab, Sprogfamilier, Sprogtyper, Sprogbrug, Sprogbygning, Sprogforandring (Language: Genealogy of Language, Language Families, Typology of Language, Language Use, Language Construction, Changes in Language)*, København 1963.
- Hobson, J.M.: *Civilizing the Global Economy: Racism and Continuity of Anglo-Saxon Imperialism*, in *Bowden & Seabrooke*, pp.60-76.
- Hock, H.H. & Joseph, B.D.: *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 93*, Berlin & New York 1996.
- Hodge, J.M.: *Science and Empire: an Overview of the Historical Scholarship*, in *Bennett & Hodge*, pp.3-29.
- Home, R.W.: *The Royal Society and the Empire: The Colonial and Commonwealth Fellowship, Part 1. 1731-1847*, in *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 56:3 (2002), pp.307-332.
- Hooker, V.M. & Hokker, M.B.: *John Leyden's Malay Annals. With an Introductory Essay*, MBRAS Reprint 20, 2001.
- Hopfl, H.P.: *From Savage to Scotsman: Conjectural History in the Scottish Enlightenment*, in *Journal of British Studies*, Vol.17, No.2 (Spring 1978), pp.19-40.
- Hoquet, T.: *History without Time: Buffon's Natural History as a Nonmathematical Physique*", in *Isis*, Vol.101, No.30 (2010), pp.30-61.

- Hornell, J.: *The Outrigger Canoes of Indonesia*, in *Madras Fisheries Bulletin*, 12:3 (1920), pp.43-114.<sup>1</sup>
- Hornell, J.: The Origins and Ethnological Significance of Indian Boat Designs, in *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1920 (Reprinted by the South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies, Trivandrum, 2002).<sup>2</sup>
- Horridge, A.: *Sailing Craft of Indonesia*, Singapore (OUP), 1986.
- Houghton, W.E. (main editor): *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900*, 5 vols. University of Toronto Press 1965-1988.
- Howe, S.: *Empire and Ideology*, in *Stockwell*, p.158-176.
- Howes, J.: *Colin Mackenzie, the Madras School of Orientalism, and Investigations at Mahabalipuram*, in *Trautmann 2009b*, pp.74-109.
- Hudson, N.: *Writing and European Thought, 1600-1830*, CUP 1994.
- Hudson, N.: *From "Nation" to "Race": The Origin of Racial Classification in Eighteenth-Century Thought*, in *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 29:3 (1996), pp.247-264.
- Hughes, D.O. and Trautmann, T.R.(eds.): *Time: Histories and Ethnologies*, University of Michigan 1995.
- Hunter, Sir W.W.: *The Life of Brian Houghton Hodgson, British Resident at the Court of Nepal, Member of the Institute of France; Fellow of the Royal Society; A Vice-President of the Royal Asiatic Society, Etc.*, London 1896.
- Hymes, D.H.: *Essays in the History of Linguistic Anthropology*, John Benjamins 1983.
- Hymes, D.H.: *Lexicostatistics and Glottochronology in the Nineteenth Century (With Notes Toward a General History)*, in *Hymes*, pp.59-113.
- Høiris, O.: *Forfald og Fremskridt: Analytiske hovedfigurer i den antropologiske erkendelseshistorie (Decline and Progress: Analytical Main Figures in the History of Anthropological Epistemology)*, Århus Universitet, Arbejdspapirer Center for Kulturforskning 86-00, 2000.
- Høiris, O.: *Antropologien i Antikken (Anthropology in the Antiquity)*, Århus Universitetsforlag 2001. ("Høiris, 2001a")
- Høiris, O.: *Teologi, Antropologi og Akæologi: Om de fremmede som vor fortid og oprindelse (Theology, Anthropology, and Archeology: On the Other as Our Past and Origin)*, Århus Universitet, Arbejdspapirer Center for Kulturforskning 97-01, 2001. ("Høiris, 2001b")

<sup>1</sup> Followed by 16 plates depicting various boat types.

<sup>2</sup> Can be accessed at: <http://www.siffs.org/books/indianboatdesign.pdf>

- Inden, R.: *Imagining India*, Cambridge, Ma. 1990.
- Ingleson, J.: *Expanding the Empire: James Brooke and the Sarawak Lobby, 1839-1868*, Research Paper No.2, Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Western Australia, 1979.
- Irvine, J.T.: *Language Fields: Robert Needham Cust's Language Map of South Asia, 1878*, in *Talbot*, pp.31-54.
- Irwin, G.: *Nineteenth-Century Borneo: A Study in Diplomatic Rivalry*, S-Gravenhage, 1955.
- Irwin, R.: *1001 Nat. En Indføring*, København 2005.<sup>1</sup>
- Irwin, R.: *Dangerous Knowledge: Orientalism & Its Discontents*, New York 2008 (Published in Great Britain in 2006 as *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*).
- Jahoda, G.: *Intra-European Racism in Nineteenth-Century Anthropology*, in *History and Anthropology*, 20:1 (2009), pp.37-56.
- Jefcoate, G.: *Asiatick Researches: English Sources for Oriental Studies in Göttingen University Library*, in *Libraries & Culture*, 33:3 (1998), pp.283-293.
- Jones, D.M.: *The Image of China in Western Social and Political Thought*, London 2001.
- Jones, G.S.: *Radicalism and the Extra-European World: the Case of Karl Marx*, in *Bell*, pp.186-213.
- Jones, R.: *Earl, Logan, and "Indonesia"*, in *Archipel* 6 (1973), pp.93-118.
- Jones, R.: *Malay Study and the British. I: An Outline History to the Early Twentieth Century*, in *Archipel* 28:1 (1984), pp.117-148.
- Jones, R.: *George Windsor Earl and 'Indonesia'*, in *Indonesia and the Malay World* 64 (1994), pp.279-290.
- Jones, W.T.: *A History of Western Philosophy: The Classic Mind*, 2.ed., 1970. (Jones 1970)
- Joseph, J.E.: *A Matter of Consequenz: Humboldt, Race and the Genius of the Chinese Language*, in *Historiographia Linguistica*, 26:1 (1999), pp.89-148.
- Kapila, S.: *Race Matters: Orientalism and Religion, India and Beyond c.1770-1880*, in *Modern Asian Studies*, 41:3 (2007), pp.471-513.
- Kass, A.M.: *Hodgkin, Thomas*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Kathirithamby-Wells, J.: *Peninsular Malaysia in the Context of Natural History and Colonial Science*, in *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 11:1 (2009), pp.337-374.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Danish translation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition of R. Irwin's *The Arabian Nights: A Companion*.

- Keane, A.H.: *On the Relations of the Indo-Chinese and Inter-Oceanic Races and Languages*, in *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol.9 (1880), pp.254-289.
- Keay, J.: *The Honourable Company: A History of the English East India Company*, London 1991.
- Keay, J.: *The Great Arc: The Dramatic Tale of How India was Mapped and Everest was Named*, London 2000.
- Keay, J.: *India Discovered: The Recovery of a Lost Civilization*, London 2001 (orig.1981).
- Keegan, J.: *Krigen's Historie (A History of Warfare)*, København 2000 (orig. 1993).
- Keeley, L.H.: *War before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage*, OUP 1996.
- Keevak, M.: *Becoming Yellow: A Short History of Racial Thinking*, Princeton University Press 2011.
- Kelley, D.R.: *The Rise of Prehistory*, in *Journal of World History*, Vol.14, No.1 (2003), pp.17-36.
- Kelly, D.(ed.): *Lineages of Empire: The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought*, OUP for the British Academy 2009.
- Kenny, R.: *From the Curse of Ham to the Curse of Nature*, in *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 40:3 (2007), pp.367-388.
- Kerijawal, O.P.: *The Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Discovery of India's Past 1784-1838*, Delhi OUP 1988.
- Kettler, D.: *History and Theory in Ferguson's Essay on the History of Civil Society: A Reconsideration*, in *Political Theory*, Vol.5:4 (Nov. 1977), pp.437-460.
- Kheng, C.B.: *Feudalism in Pre-Colonial Malaya: The Past as a Colonial Discourse*, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 25, 2 (Sept. 1994), pp.243-269.
- Kibbee, D.A. (ed.): *History of Linguistics 2005. Selected Papers from the Tenth International Conference on the History of Language Sciences (ICHoLS X), 1-5 September 2005, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois*, Amsterdam 2007.
- Kidd, C.: *Race, Empire, and Scottish Nationhood*, in *The Historical Journal*, 46:4 (2003), pp.873-892.
- Kidd, C.: *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000*, CUP 2006.
- Killingray, D.; Lincoln, M.; & Rigby, N. (eds.): *Maritime Empires: British Imperial Maritime Trade in the Nineteenth Century*, London 2004.

- King, V.: *The Development of Southeast Asian Studies in the United Kingdom (and Europe): the Making of a Region*, in *Leeds East Asia Papers*, New Series, Paper No.3, University of Leeds 2010.
- Klöter, H.: *Facts and Fantasy about Favorlang: Early European Encounters with Taiwan's Languages*, in *Lubotshy, Schaeken, & Wiedenhof*, pp.207-223.
- Knapman, G.: *Liberal Dreams: materialism and Evolutionary Civil Society in the Projection of Nation in Southeast Asia*, in *Asian Ethnicity*, Vol.7, No.1 (2006), pp.19-36.
- Knapman, G.: *Race, Empire and Liberalism: Interpreting John Crawford's History of the Indian Archipelago*, Paper presented to the 17<sup>th</sup> Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia in Melbourne 1-3 July 2008. Available at <http://arts.monash.edu.au/mai/asaa/garethknapman.pdf>. (Knapman 2008a)
- Knapman, G.: *Orang-utans, Tribes, and Nations: Degeneracy, Primordialism, and the Chain of Being*, in *History and Anthropology*, 19:2 (Jun 2008), pp.143-159. (Knapman 2008b)
- Koditschek, T.: *Narrative Time and racial/Evolutionary Time in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Imperial History*, in *Hall & McClelland*, pp.36-55.
- Koditschek, T.: *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain*, CUP 2011. (Koditschek 2011a)
- Koditschek, T.: *Supplementary Notes to "Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain"*, (Koditschek 2011b), taken from: <https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/handle/10355/7818>
- Koebner, R.: *Despot and Despotism: Vicissitudes of a Political Term*, in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol.14:3/4 (1951), pp.275-302.
- Koerner, E.F.K.: *The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis: A Preliminary History and a Bibliographical Essay*, in *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2:2 (1992), pp.173-198.
- Koerner, E.F.K.: *Linguistics and Ideology in the Study of Language*, taken from [www.tulane.edu/~howard/LangIdeo/Koerner/Koerner.html](http://www.tulane.edu/~howard/LangIdeo/Koerner/Koerner.html), No Year.
- Kouznetsova, S.: *Colin Mackenzie as a Collector of Javanese Manuscripts and Manuscript BL MSS JAV. 29*, in *Indonesia and the Malay World*, Vol.36, No.106 (2008), pp.375-394.
- Krishnan, S.: *Reading Globalization from the Margin: The Case of Abdullah Munshi*, in *Representations*, 99 (Summer 2007), pp.40-73.
- Kroeber, A.L. & Kluckhohn, C.: *Culture. A Criticval Review of Concepts and Defininitions*, Cambridge MA 1952. (In the Series *Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archæology and Ethnology*, Harvard University, Vol.XLVII, No.1.

- Kumagai, Y.: *Kirkman Finlay and John Crawford: Two Scots in the Campaign of the Glasgow East India Association for the Opening of the China Trade, 1829-1833*, in *Journal of Scottish Historical Studies*, 30:2 (2010), pp.175-199.
- Kurfurst, R.: *John Stuart Mill's Asian Parable*, in *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, XXXIV:3 (Sep. 2001), pp.601-619.
- Lamb, J.: *Eye-Witnessing in the South Seas*, in *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 38 (1997), pp.201-212.
- Lambert, D. & Lester, A.(eds.): *Colonial Lives Across the British Empire: Imperial Careering in the Long Nineteenth Century*, CUP 2006.
- Land, S.K.: *Adam Smith's "Considerations Concerning the First Formation of Languages"*, in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38:4 (1977), pp.677-690.
- Landau, P.: *Language*, in *Etherington*, pp.194-215.
- Lee, D.: *Java, Insincerity, and Imposture: The Stories of Stamford Raffles and Mary Baker*, in *European Romantic Review*, Vol.15, No.2, June 2004, pp.277-287.
- Lepschy, G. (ed.): *History of Linguistics. Volume III: Renaissance and early Modern Linguistics*, London 1998.
- Lester, A.: *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain*, London 2001.
- Lester, A.: *Humanitarians and White Settlers in the Nineteenth Century*, in *Etherington*, pp.64-85. (Lester 2005)
- Lester, A.: *Imperial Circuits and Networks: geographies of the British Empire*, in *History Compass* 4:1 (2006), pp.124-141.
- Lieberman, V.: *Local Integration and Euroasian Analogies: Structuring Southeast Asian History, c.1350-c.1830*, in *Modern Asian Studies* 27:3 (1993), pp.475-572.
- Liebersohn, H.: *The Travelers' World: Europe to the Pacific*, Harvard University Press 2006.
- Lifschitz, A.S.: *Language as the Key to the Epistemological Labyrinth: Turgot's Changing View of Human Perception*, in *Historiographica Linguistica*, 31:3 (2004), pp.345-365.
- Lightman, B.: *Refashioning the Spaces of London Science: Elite Epistemes in the Nineteenth-Century*, in *Livingstone & Withers 2011*, pp.25-50.
- Liu, L.H.: *The Clash of Empires: The Invention of China in Modern World Making*, Harvard University Press 2004.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *The Moral Discourse of Climate: Historical Considerations on Race, Place, and Virtue*, in *Journal of Historical Geography*, 17:4 (1991), pp.413-434.

- Livingstone, D.N.: *The Geographical Tradition*, Blackwell 1992. (Livingstone 1992a)
- Livingstone, D.N.: *The Preadamite Theory and the Marriage between Science and Religion*”, in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series 82:3 (1992), pp.i+iii+v+vii+ix+x+1-78. (Livingstone 1992b)
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Reproduction, Representation, and Authenticity: A Rereading*, in *Transactions of the British Institute of Geographers*, 23:1 (1998), pp.13-19.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Putting Science in Its Place: Geographies of Scientific Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press 2003.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Science, Text, and Space: Thoughts on the Geography of Reading*, in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series 30:4 (2005), pp.391-401.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Science, Site, and Speech: Scientific Knowledge and the Spaces of Rhetoric*, in *History of the Human Sciences*, 20:2 (2007), pp.71-98.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Adam’s Ancestors: Race, religion, & the Politics of Human Origins*, Johns Hopkins University press 2008.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Cultural Politics and the Racial Cartographics of Human Origins*, in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35 (2010), pp.204-221.
- Livingstone, D.N.: *Politics, Culture, and Human Origins: Geographies of Reading and Reputation in Nineteenth-Century Science*, in *Livingstone & Withers 2011*, pp.178-202.
- Livingstone, D.N. & Harrison, R.T.: *Meaning through Metaphor: Analogy as Epistemology*, in *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 71:1 (1981), pp.95-107.
- Livingstone, D.N. & Harrison, R.T.: *On “Meaning through Metaphor”*, in *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 72:2 (1982), pp.272-277.
- Livingstone, D.N. & Withers, C.W.J.(eds.): *Geography and Enlightenment*, University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Livingstone, D.N. & Withers, C.W.J.: *Introduction: on Geography and Enlightenment*, in *Livingstone & Withers 1999*, pp.1-31.
- Livingstone, D.N. & Withers, C.W.J.(eds.): *Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Science*, University of Chicago Press 2011.
- Livingstone, D.N. & Withers, C.W.J.: *Thinking Geographically about Nineteenth-Century Science*, in *Livingstone & Withers 2011*, pp.1-19.
- Lloyd, C.: *Mr. Barrow of the Admiralty: A Life of Sir John Barrow 1764-1848*, London 1970.
- Lorimer, D.: *From Natural Science to Social Science: Race and the Language of Race Relations in Late Victorian and Edwardian Discourse*, in *Kelly*, pp.181-212.



- Lovejoy, A.O.: *The Great Chain of Being*, Harvard University Press 1964 (org. 1936; based on his famous “William James Lectures from 1933).
- Lubotsky, A.; Schaeken, J.; & Wiedenhof, J.(eds.): *Evidence and Counter-Evidence: Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt. Vol.2: General Linguistics*, Rodopi 2008.
- Lucassen, J., Lucassen, L., & Manning, P.(eds.): *Migration History in World History: Multidisciplinary Approaches*, Brill 2010.
- Macfie, A.L.: *Orientalism*, London 2002.
- Macgregor, I.A.: *Some Aspects of Portuguese Historical Writing of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries on South East Asia*, in Hall, pp.172-199.
- Mackenzie, J.: *Empire and National Identities: The Case of Scotland*, in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6. Ser., Vol.8 (1998), pp.215-231.
- Magee, G.B. & Thompson, A.S.: *Empire and Globalisation: Networks of People, Goods, and Capital in the British World, c.1850-1914*, CUP 2010.
- Majeed, J.: *James Mill’s ‘The History of British India’ and Utilitarianism as a Rhetoric of Reform*, in *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol.24, No.2 (May 1990), pp.209-224.
- Majeed, J.: *Ungoverned Imaginings: James Mill’s “The History of British India” and Orientalism*, OUP 1992.
- Malik, K.: *The Meaning of Race: Race, History and Culture in Western Society*, New York 1996.
- Mallory, J.P.: *A Short History of the Indo-European Problem*, in *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 1:1 (1973), pp.21-65.
- Manickam, S.K.: *Common Ground: Race and the Colonial Universe in British Malaya*, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 40:3 (2009), pp.593-612. (Manickam 2009a)
- Manickam, S.K.: *Africans in Asia: The Discourse of ‘Negritos’ in Early Nineteenth-century Southeast Asia*, in Hägerdal, pp.69-86. (Manickam 2009b)
- Manning, P.: *Homo Sapiens Populates the Earth: A Provisional Synthesis, Privileging Linguistic Evidence*, in *Journal of World History*, 17:2 (2006), pp.115-158.
- Marchand, S.L.: *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship*, CUP 2010 (Org. 2009).
- Marriott, J.: *The other empire: Metropolis, India and progress in the colonial imagination*, Manchester University Press 2003.
- Marrison, G.E.: *John Crawfurd and the Malay Manuscript Collection in the British Library*, in *Majalah Perpustakaan Malaysia*, 9 (1981), pp.5-12.

- Marshall, P.J.; Van Niel, R.; et al: *India and Indonesia During the Ancient Regime*, Leiden/New York 1988.
- Marshall, P.J. & Williams, G.: *The Great Map of Mankind: British Perceptions of the World in the Age of Enlightenment*, London, 1982.
- Marshall, P.J.: *British Assessment of the Dutch in Asia in the Age of Raffles*, in Marshall, Van Niel et al, pp.1-16.
- Mawyer, A.: *The Oceanic drift in Polynesian linguistics*, in *Language & Communication*, 28 (2008), pp.363-385.
- Mazlish, B.: *Civilization and Its Contents*, Stanford University Press 2004
- McConvell, P.: *The Archaeo-Linguistics of Migration*, in Lucassen, Lucassen, & Manning, pp.155-188.
- McGrane, *Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other*, Columbia University Press 1989.
- McKusick, J.C.: *Coleridge and Horne Tooke*, in *Studies in Romanticism*, 24:1 (1985), pp.85-111.
- McLaren, M.: *From Analysis to Prescription: Scottish Concepts of Asian Despotism in Early Nineteenth-Century British India*, in *International History Review*, 15, No.3 (1993), pp.469-501.
- McLaren, M.: *British India & British Scotland, 1780-1830: Career Building, Empire Building, & a Scottish School of Thought on Indian Governance*, University of Akron Press 2001.
- Meek, R.L.: *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage*, CUP 1976.
- Metcalf, T.R.: *Ideologies of the Raj*, CUP 2007 (org. 1995)
- Metha, U.S.: *Liberal strategies of Exclusion*, in Cooper & Stoler, pp.59-86.
- Metha, U.S.: *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*, University of Chicago Press 1999.
- Middleton, A.: *Rajah Brooke and the Victorians*, in *The Historical Journal*, 53:2 (2010), pp.381-400.
- Milner, A.: *Notes on C.H. Thomsen. Missionary to the Malays*, in *Indonesia Circle. School of Oriental & African Studies*, 9:25 (1981), pp.45-54.
- Milner, A.: *The Invention of politics in Colonial Malaya*, CUP 2002.
- Milner, A.: *The Malays*, Wiley-Blackwell 2011.
- Momigliano, A.: *Ancient History and the Antiquarian*, in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol.13, No.3/4. (1950), pp.285-315.
- Moore, G.M.: *Who were the Alfuros?*, in *Conradiana*, 39:3 (2007), pp.198-210.

- Moses, A.D. (ed.): *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History*, New York & Oxford 2008.
- Müller, F. Max.: *The Life and Letters of the Right Honourable Friedrich Max Müller*; Edited by His Wife. 2 vols., London 1902.
- Munshi, A. & Thomson, J.T. (translator and editor): *Translations from the Hakayit Adbulla (Bin Abdulkadar Munshi). With Comments by J.T. Thomson, F.R.G.S.*, London 1874.
- Myres, J.L.: *The Influence of Anthropology on the Course of Political Science*, University of California Press 1916.
- Neill, A.: *British Discovery Literature and the Rise of Global Commerce*, New York 2002.
- Newbury, C.: *Patrons, Clients, and Empire: The Subordination of Indigenous Hierarchies in Asia and Africa*, in *Journal of World History*, Vol,II:2 (2000), pp.227-263.
- Newbury, C.: *Patrons, Clients, and Empire: Chieftaincy and Over-rule in Asia, Africa, and the Pacific*, OUP 2003.
- Noorduy, J.: *C.H. Thomsen; the Editor of a Code of Bugis Maritime Laws*, in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde*, 113:3 (1957), pp.238-251.
- O'Brien, K.: *Empire, History, and Emigration. From Enlightenment to Liberalism*, in *Hall & McClelland*, pp.15-35.
- O'Hanlon, R. & Washbrook, D.A.: *After Orientalism: Culture, Criticism, and Politics in the Third World*, in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34:1 (1992), pp.141-167.
- Olender, M.: *The Languages of Paradise. Aryans and Semites: A Match Made in Heaven*, New York 2002 (org. in French 1989).
- Osterhammel, J.: *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Princeton 2005 (org. in German 1995).
- O'Sullivan, L. & Fuller, C. (Eds.): *The Correspondence of Jeremy Bentham; Vol.12, July 1824 to June 1828*, Clarendon Press 2006.
- Pagden, A. (ed.): *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe*, CUP 1987.
- Pagden, A.: *Lords of all the world: ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France c. 1500-c. 1800*, Yale University Press 1995.
- Pagden, A.: *Peoples and Empires: Europeans and the Rest of the World, from Antiquity to Present*, London 2001.
- Palmeri, F.: *Conjectural History and the Origins of Sociology in Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 37 (2008), pp.1-21.
- Pannu, P.: *The Production of Knowledge in Colonial Malaya*, in *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 37 (2009), pp.427-451.

- Pawley, A.: *Prehistoric Migration and Colonisation Processes in Oceania: A View from Historical Linguistics and Archaeology*, in Lucassen, Lucassen, & Manning, pp.77-112.
- Pawley, A. & Ross, M.: *The Prehistory of Oceanic Languages: Current View*, in Bellwood, Fox, & Tryon, pp.43-80.
- Paxman, D.B.: *Language and Difference: The problem of Abstraction in Eighteenth-Century Language Study*, in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 54:1 (Jan. 1993), pp.19-36.
- Paxman, D.B.: "Adam in a Strange Country": *Locke's Language Theory and Travel Literature*, in *Modern Philology*, 92:4 (May 1995), pp.460-481.
- Paxman, D.B.: *Voyage into Language: Space and the Linguistic Encounter, 1500-1800*, London 2003.
- Pels, P.: *The Anthropology of Colonialism: Culture, History, and the Emergence of Western Governmentality*, in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 1997, 26, pp.163-183.
- Pels, P.: *The Rise and Fall of the Indian Aborigines: Orientalism, Anglicism, and the Emergence of an Ethnology of India*, in Pels & Salemink, pp.82-116.
- Pels, P. & Salemink, O.: *Introduction: Locating the Colonial Subjects of Anthropology*, in Pels & Salemink. pp.1-52.
- Pels, P & Salemink, O. (eds.): *Colonial Subjects: Essays in the Practical History of Anthropology*, University of Michigan Press 1999,
- Pennycook, A.: *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*, London 1998.
- Pinch, W.R.: Review: Same Difference in India and Europe, in *History and Theory*, Vol.38, No.3 (1999), pp.389-407.
- Pinker, S.: *The Language Instinct*, London 1994.
- Pitts, J.: *Legislator of the World? A Rereading of Bentham on Colonies*, in *Political Theory*, 31:2 (Apr. 2003), pp.200-234).
- Pitts, J.: *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*, Princeton University Press 2005.
- Pocock, J.G.A.: *The Concept of a Language and the Métier d'Historien: Some Considerations on Practice*, in Pagden 1987, pp.19-38.
- Pocock, J.G.A.: *Barbarism and Religion, Vol.II: Narratives of Civil Government*, CUP 1999.
- Pocock, J.G.A.: *Barbarism and Religion, Vol.IV: Barbarians, Savages and Empires*, CUP 2005.
- Pollock, S.: *Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History*, in *Public Culture*, 12:3 (2000), pp.591-625.

- Pollock, S.: *The Language of Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*, University of California Press 2006.
- Pollock, S.: *Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World*, in *Critical Inquiry*, 35:4 (2009), pp.931-961.
- Pollock, S.(ed.): *Forms of Knowledge in Early Modern Asia: Explorations in the Intellectual History of India and Tibet, 1500-1800*, Duke University Press 2011.
- Poovey, M.: *A History of the Modern Fact: Problems of Knowledge in the Sciences of Wealth and Society*, Chicago 1998.
- Porter, A.: *An Overview, 1700-1914*, in *Etherington*, pp.40-63. (Porter 2005)
- Porter, R.: *The Greatest Benefit to Mankind: A Medical History of Humanity*, London 1997.
- Powell, A.A.: *Scottish Orientalists and India: The Muir Brothers, Religion, Education and Empire*, London 2010.
- Pratt, M.L.: *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, London and New York 1992.
- Pratt, P.P.: *Peter Du Ponceau's Contributions to Anthropology*, in *Ethnohistory*, 18:2 (1971), pp.147-158.
- Putten, J. van der: *Abdullah Munsyi and the Missionaries*, in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde*, 162:4 (2006), pp.407-440.
- Quilty, M.C.: *Textual Empires: A Reading of Early British Histories of Southeast Asia*, Monash Asia Institute 1998.
- Quilty, M.C.: *Free Ports and Other Freedoms: The Antislavery Movement and Competition Between The East and West Indies*, notes from the Seminar "The Penang Story – International Conference, 18-21 April 2002".
- Qureshi, S.: *Robert Gordon Latham, Displayed Peoples, and the Natural History of Race, 1854-1866*, in *The Historical Journal*, 54:1 (2011), pp.143-166.
- Raby, P.: *Bright Paradise: Victorian Scientific Travellers*, London 1996.
- Raj, K.: *Refashioning Civilities, Engineering Trust: William Jones, Indian Intermediaries and the Production of Reliable Legal Knowledge in Late Eighteenth-Century Bengal*, in *Studies in History*. 17:2 (2001), pp.175-209.
- Raj, K.: *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900*, London 2007 (org. 2006)
- Rainger, R.: *Race, Politics, and Science: The Anthropological society of London in the 1860s*, in *Victorian Studies* 22:1 (1978), pp.51-70.

- Ramaswamy, S.: *Catastrophic Cartographies: Mapping the Lost Continent of Lemuria*, in *Representations* 67 (1999), pp.92-129.
- Rask, K.: *Rasmus Rask: Store tanker I et lille land (Rasmus Rask: Great Thoughts in a Small Country)*, København 2002.
- Ray, H.P.: *Narratives of Faith: Buddhism and Colonial Archaeology in Monsoon Asia*, in *Asia Research Institute: Working Papers Series*, No.99 (2007), Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore.
- Reece, R.H.W.: *George Windsor Earl and the Indian Archipelago*, in *The Push from the Bush* 12 (1982), pp.6-40.
- Reece, R.H.W.: *Introduction*, in *S. St. John 1994 (orig.1879)*, pp.vii-l.
- Reid, A.: *Understanding Melayu (Malay) as a Source of Diverse Modern Identities*, in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 32 (3) (Oct. 2001), pp.295-313.
- Reill, P.H.: *Science and the Construction of the Cultural Sciences in Late Enlightenment Germany: The Case of Wilhelm von Humboldt*, in *History and Theory*, 33:3 (1994), pp.345-366.
- Rendall, J.: *Scottish Orientalism: From Robertson to James Mill*, in *The Historical Journal* Vol.25, No.1 (Mar., 1982), pp.43-69.
- Richards, E.: *The "Moral Anatomy" of Robert Knox: The Interplay between Biological and Social Thought in Victorian Scientific Naturalism*, in *Journal of the History of Biology*, 22:3 (1989), pp.373-436.
- Riper, A.B. van: *Men among the Mammoths: Victorian Science and the Discovery of Human Prehistory*, University of Chicago Press 1993.
- Reutter, G.: *Wilhelm von Humboldts linguistisches System. Seine Position in der Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, Schöningh 2007.
- Robson, R. (ed.): *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark*, London 1967.
- Roberts, J.: *Claiming the High Ground: Tengger Buddhism*, in "Barley (ed.)", pp.67-76.
- Roberts, L.: *Science and Global History, 1750-1850: Local Encounters and Global Circulation*, in *Itinerario*, 33:1 (2009), pp.9-30.
- Rocher, R.: *New Data for the Biography of the Orientalist Alexander Hamilton*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 90:3 (1970), pp.426-448.
- Rocher, R.: *Sanskrit for Civil Servants 1806-1818*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 122: (2002), pp.38-390.

- Rosenberg, D.: 'A New Sort of Logick and Critick': Etymological Interpretation in Horne Tooke's *"The Diversions of Purley"*, in Burke & Porter, pp.300-329.
- Rosenberg, D. & Grafton, A.: *Cartographies of Time: A History of the Timeline*, Princeton 2010.
- Ross, M.: *On the Origin of the Term "Malayo-Polynesian"*, in *Oceanic Linguistics*, 35:1 (1996), pp.143-145.
- Rowe, D.J.: [\*London Radicalism 1830-1843: A Selection of the Papers of Francis Place\*](#), London 1970.
- Rowley-Conwy, P.: *From Genesis to Prehistory: The Archaeological Three Age System and its Contested Reception in Denmark, Britain, and Ireland*, OUP 2007.
- Roy, A.: *Civility and Empire: Literature and Culture in British India, 1822-1922*, London 2005.
- Rubiés, J.-P.: *Oriental Despotism and European Orientalism: Botero to Montesquieu*, in JEMH 9, 1-2 (2005), pp.109-180.
- Rudwick, M.J.S: *Bursting the Limits of Time: the Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Revolution*, University of Chicago Press 2005.
- Rudwick, M.J.S: *Worlds Before Adam: the Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Reform*, University of Chicago Press 2008.
- Rupke, N.: *A Geography of Enlightenment: The Critical Reception of Alexander von Humboldt's Mexico Work*, in Withers & Livingstone, pp.281-294.
- Rutter, O.: *The Pirate Wind: Tales of the Sea-Robbers of Malaya*, Singapore OUP 1986 (org. 1930).
- Ryan, T.: 'Le Président des Terres Australes': Charles de Brosses and the French Enlightenment Beginnings of Oceanic Anthropology, in *Journal of Pacific History*, 37:2 (2002), pp.157-186.
- Safier, N.: *Global Knowledge on the Move: Itineraries, American Narratives, and Deep Histories of Science*, in *Isis*, 101 (2010), pp.133-145.
- Said, E.: *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London 1995 (org. 1978).
- Sample, J.: 'The First Appearance of This Celebrated Capital'; or, What Mr. Barrow Saw in the Land of the Chinaman, in Clark & Smethurst, pp.31-46.
- Sartori, A.: *The Resonance of "Culture": Framing a Problem in Global Concept-History*, in *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 47:4 (2005), pp.676-699.
- Sartori, A.: *The British Empire and Its Liberal Mission*, in *The Journal of Modern History*, 78:3 (2006), pp.623-642.

- Sartori, A.: *Bengal in Global Concept History: Culturalism in the Age of Capital*, University of Chicago Press 2008.
- Sather, C.: *Sea Nomads and Rainforest Hunter-Gatherers: Foraging Adaptations in the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*, in Bellwood, Fox, & Tryon, pp.245-285.
- Schaffer, S., Roberts, L., Raj, K., & Delburgo, J. (eds.): *The Brokered World: Go-Betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820*, Science History Publications 2009.
- Schnapp, A.: *The Discovery of the Past*, New York 1997 (org. in French 1993).
- Schoenfield, M.: *British Periodicals and Romantic Identity: The "Literary Lower Empire"*, New York 2009.
- Schreyer, R.: "Savage" Languages in Eighteenth-Century Theoretical History of Language, in Gray & Fiering, pp.310-326.
- Scott, D.: *Colonial Governmentality*, in *Social Text*, 43 (1995), pp.191-220.
- Sebastiani, S.: *Conjectural History vs. The Bible: Eighteenth-Century Scottish Historians and the idea of history in the Encyclopaedia Britannica*, in *Cromohs*, 6 (2001), pp.1-6.
- Sebastiani, S.: *Race and National Characters in Eighteenth-Century Scotland: The Polygenetic Discourses of Kames and Pinkerton*, in *Cromohs*, 8 (2003), pp.1-14.
- Semmel, B.: *The Philosophic Radicals and Colonialism*, in *The Journal of Economic History*, 21:4 (1961), pp.513-525.
- Semmel, B.: *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism: Classical Political Economy, the Empire of Free Trade, and Imperialism, 1750-1850*, CUP 1970.
- Sen, S.: *Distant Sovereignty: national Imperialism and the Origins of British India*, London 2002.
- Shapin, S.: *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*, University of Chicago Press 1994.
- Shapin, S.: *Placing the View from Nowhere: Historical and Sociological Problems in the Location of Science*, in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, 23:1 (1998), pp.5-12.
- Sillitoe, P.: *The Role of Section H at the British Association for the Advancement of Science in the History of Anthropology*, in *Durham Anthropology Journal* 13:2 (2005), (electronic version with no pagination).
- Simone, R.: *The Early Modern Period*, in *Lepschy* vol.III, pp.149-236.
- Sivasundaram, S.: *Sciences and the Global: on Methods, Questions, and Theory*, in *Isis*, 101 (2010), pp.146-158.



- Skinner, C.: *The Author of the 'Hikayat Perintah Negeri Benggala'*, in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, 132:2-3 (1976), pp.195-206.
- Smith, F.A.: *Missionaries, Mariners, and Merchants: Overlooked British Travelers to West Borneo in the Early Nineteenth Century*, in *Borneo Research Bulletin*, 33 (2002), pp.45-61.
- Smith, F.A.: *Captain Burn and Associates: British Intelligence-Gathering, Trade, and Litigation in Borneo and Beyond During the Early Nineteenth Century*, in *Borneo Research Bulletin*, 35 (2004), pp.48-69.
- Smith, F.A.: *An "Arch-Villain" to be Rehabilitated? Mixed Perceptions of Pangeran Anom of Sambas in the Early Nineteenth Century; with an Appendix in John Hunt*, in *Borneo Research Bulletin*, 38 (2007), pp.101-117.
- Smith, M.D.: *Peter Stephen Du Ponceau and His Study of Languages: A Historical Account*, in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 127:3 (1983), pp.143-179.
- Smith, V.: *The Myth of the Noble Savage (Review)*, in *Journal of World History*, 15:1 (2004), pp.96-99.
- Soedjatmoko; Ali, M.; Resink, G. J.; Kahin, G. McT. (eds.): *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, Cornell University Press 1965.
- Spadafora, D.: *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Yale University Press 1990.
- Spence, J.: *El Gran Continente del Khan*, Madrid 1999 (Org. in English as *The Chan's Great Continent: China in Western Minds*, 1999).
- Stafford, R.A.: *Scientist of Empire: Sir Roderick Murchinson, scientific exploration and Victorian imperialism*, CUP 1989.
- Stagl, J.: *A History of Curiosity: The Theory of Travel 1550-1800*, London 1995.
- Stagl, J.: *Introduction: From Travel Writing to Ethnography*, in *History and Anthropology*, 9:2-3 (1996), p.121-124.
- Stahl, A.B.: *Concepts of Time and Approaches to Analogical Reasoning in Historical Perspective*, in *American Antiquity*, Vol.58, No.2 (Apr. 1993), pp.235-260.
- Staum, M.: *Labelling People: French Scholars on Society, Race, and Empire, 1815-1848*, McGill-Queen's University Press 2003.
- Stock, P.: *"Almost a Separate Race": Racial Thought and the Idea of Europe in British Encyclopedias and Histories, 1771-1830*, in *Modern Intellectual History*, 8:1 (2011), pp.3-29.
- Stocking, G.W.: *What's in a Name? The Origins of the Royal Anthropological Institute (1837-1871)*, in *Man* Vol.6, No.3 (1971), pp.369-390.

- Stocking, G.W.: *From Prichard to Ethnology: James Cowles Prichard and British Anthropology 1800-1850*, pp.vii-cxlv in Prichard 1973.
- Stocking, G.W.: *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*, University of Chicago Press 1982. (Org. 1968)
- Stocking, G. W.: *Victorian Anthropology*, Macmillan, 1987.
- Stockwell, S. (ed.): *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*, London 2008.
- Stokes, E.: *English Utilitarians and India* OUP 1959.
- Struik, D.J.: *A Concise History of Mathematics*, New York 1987 (4. Rev. ed.).
- Sweeney, A.: *Abdullah Bin Kadir Munsyi: a Man of Bananas and Thorns*, in *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 34:100 (2006), pp.223-245.
- Swiggers, P.: *Americanist Linguistics and the Origin of Linguistic Typology: Peter Stephen Du Ponceau's "Comparative Science of Language"*, in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 142:1 (1998), pp.18-46.
- Tagliacozzo, E.: *Hydrography, Technology, Coercion: Mapping the Sea in Southeast Asian Imperialism, 1850-1900*, in *Killingray, Lincoln, & Rigby*, pp.142-158. (2004)
- Talbot, C. (ed.): *Knowing India: Colonial and Modern Constructions of the Past. Essays in Honor of Thomas T. Trautmann*, New Delhi 2011.
- Tarling, N.: *Piracy and Politics in the Malay World: A Study of British Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century South-East Asia*, 1963 (Kraus Reprint 1978).
- Tarling, N.: *Imperial Britain in Southeast Asia*, OUP Kuala Lumpur 1975.
- Tarling, N.: *The Burthen, the Risk, and the Glory: A Biography of Sir James Brooke*, OUP Kuala Lumpur 1982.
- Tarling, N.: *The British Empire in Southeast Asia*, in Winks, R.W. (ed.): *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. V, Historiography*, OUP 1999, pp.403-415.
- Tarling, N.: *Southeast Asia: a Modern History*, OUP, 2001.
- Tavoni, M.: *Renaissance Linguistics, Western Europe*, in *Lepschy*, Vol.III, pp.1-108.
- Taylor, M.: *Joseph Hume and the Reformation of India, 1819-1833*, in *Burgess & Festenstein*, pp.285-308. (Taylor 2007a)
- Taylor, S.: *Storm and Conquest: the Battle for the Indian Ocean, 1808-1810*, London 2007. (Taylor 2007b)
- Tcherkézoff, S.: *A Long and Unfortunate Voyage towards the 'Invention' of the Melanesia/Polynesia Distinction 1595-1832*, in *Journal of Pacific History*, 38:2 (2003), pp.175-196.

- Teng, H-S.: “*That Legacy of a Boatful of Pirates*” – Conspiracy in Joseph Conrad’s ‘*Almayer’s Folly*’ and ‘*An Outcast of the Islands*’, in *EuroAmerica*, 34:4 (Dec 2004), pp.555-585.
- Thapar, R.: *Some Appropriations of the Theory of Aryan Race Relating to the Beginnings of Indian History*, in *Trautmann 2005*, pp.106-128.
- Thom, M.: *Republics, Nations, and Tribes*, London 1995.
- Thomas, N; Abramson, A; Brady, I.; Green, R.C.; Sahlins, M.; Stephenson, R.A.; Valjavec, F.; & White, R.G.: *The Force of Ethnology: Origins and Significance of the Melanesia/Polynesia Division [and Comments and Replies]*, in *Current Anthropology* 30:1 (1989), pp.27-41.
- Thomas, N.: *Colonialism’s Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Polity Press 1994.
- Thomson, T.: *A Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen. Originally Edited By Robert Chambers. New Edition, Revised Throughout and Continued by the Rev. Thomas Thomson*, London 1870.
- Thompson, M.P.: *Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning*, in *History and Theory*, 32:3 (1993), pp.248-272.
- Thompson, A.: *Empire and the British State*, in *Stockwell*, pp.39-61. (Thompson 2008)
- Thurgood, G.: *From Ancient Cham to Modern Dialects: Two Thousand Years of Language Contact and Change*, Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No.28, University of Hawai’i Press 1999.
- Tiew, W.S.: *Malaysian Historical Journals (1847-1966): A Bibliometric Study*, in *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 8:1 (2003), pp.19-43.
- Tiffin, S.: *Raffles and the Barometer of Civilization: Images and Descriptions of Ruined Candis in “The History of Java”*, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Series 3, 18:3 (2008), pp.341-360.
- Tiffin, S.: *Java’s Ruined Candis and the British Picturesque Ideal*, in *Bulletin of the SOAS*, 72:3 (2009), pp.525-558.
- Topham, J.R.: *Science, Print, and Crossing Borders: Importing French Science Books into Britain, 1789-1815*, in *Livingstone & Withers 2011*, pp.311-344.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *The Revolution in Ethnological Time*, in *Man, New Series*, Vol.27, No.2 (1992), pp.379-397.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Aryans and British India*, New Delhi 2004 (org. 1997) (Trautmann, 1997/2004).

- Trautmann, T.R.: *Foreword*, in *Waterhouse*, pp.xiii-xix.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Discovering Aryan and Dravidian in British India: A tale of Two Cities*, in *Historiographia Linguistica*, XXXI:1 (2004), pp.33-58.
- Trautmann, T.R. (Ed.): “The Aryan Debate”, OUP New Delhi 2005.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Introduction*, in *Trautmann 2005*, pp.xiii-xliii.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Constructing the Racial Theory of Indian Civilization*, pp.85-105 in *Trautmann 2005*.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Languages and Nations: The Dravidian Proof in Colonial Madras*, University of California Press 2006.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *The Clash of Chronologies: Ancient India in the Modern World*, New Delhi 2009. (*Trautmann 2009a*)
- Trautmann, T.R.(ed.): *The Madras School of Orientalism: Producing Knowledge in Colonial South India*, OUP, New Delhi 2009. (*Trautmann 2009b*)
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Introduction*, in *Trautmann 2009b*, pp.1-25.
- Trautmann, T.R.: *Riot over Ryotwar*, in *Trautmann 2009b*, pp.310-332.
- Trevor-Roper, H.: *The Scottish Enlightenment*, in *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth-Century*, lviii (1967), pp.1635-1658.
- Trigger, B.G.: *A History of Archaeological Thought*, CUP 2009 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).
- Tryon, D.: *Proto-Austronesian and the Major Austronesian Subgroups*, in *Bellwood, Fox, & Tryon*, pp.19-41.
- Tsao, T.M.: *A Reading of Readings: English Travel Books, Audiences, and Modern Chinese History, c1832 to the Present*, in *Clark & Smethurst*, pp.47-70.
- Turnbull, C.M.: *The European Commercial Community in Singapore, 1819-1867*, in *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 10:1 (1969), pp.12-35.
- Turnbull, C.M.: *John Crawfurd*, article in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
- Turnbull, C.M.: *Introduction*, in *Earl 1971*, pp.v-xviii.
- Turnbull, C.M.: *The Straits Settlements 1826-1867: Indian Presidency to Crown Colony*, London 1972.
- Turner, M.J.: ‘Setting the Captive Free’: *Thomas Perronet Thompson, British Radicalism, and the West Indies 1820s-1860s*, in *Slavery & Abolition*, 26:1 (2005), pp.115-132.
- Twells, A.: *The Civilizing Mission and the English Middle Class, 1792-1850: the ‘Heathens’ at Home and Overseas*, London 2009.
- Underhill, J.W.: *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*, Edinburgh University Press 2009.

- Van Niel, R.: *Dutch Views and Uses of British Policy in India around 1800*, in Marshall, Van Niel et al, pp.17-32.
- Vessey, D.: *Language as Encoding Thought vs. Language as a Medium of Thought: On the Question of J.G. Fichte's Influence on Wilhelm von Humboldt*, in *Idealistic Studies* 36:3 (2006), pp.219-234.
- Vetter, J.: *Wallace's Other Line: Human Biogeography and Field Practise in the Eastern Colonial Tropics*, in *Journal of the History of Biology*, 39 (2006), pp.89-123.
- Vetter, J.: *The Unmaking of an Anthropologist: Wallace returns from the Field, 1862-1870*, in *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, (Publ. online, 2009), pp.1-18.
- Vlekke, B.H.M.: *Nusantara: A History of Indonesia*, The Hague 1965 (org. 1943).
- Wagoner, P.B.: *Precolonial Intellectuals and the Production of Colonial Knowledge*, in *Studies in Comparative Society and History*, 45 (2003), pp.783-814.
- Walker, J.H.: *Power and Prowess: The Origins of Brooke Kingship in Sarawak*, University of Hawai'i Press 2002.
- Wallace, C.M.: *Coleridge's Theory on Language*, in *Philological Quarterly*, 59:3 (1980), pp.338-353.
- Wallis, H.: *Java la Grande: The Enigma of the Dieppe Maps*, in *Williams & Frost*, pp.39-82.
- Warren, J.F.: *The Sulu Zone 1768-1898: the Dynamics of External Trade, Slavery, and Ethnicity in the Transformation of a Southeast Asian Maritime State*, Singapore 2007 (2<sup>nd</sup>. Ed.; org. ed. from 1981).
- Warren, J.F.: *Iranun and Balangini: Globalization, Maritime raiding, and the Birth of Ethnicity*, Singapore 2002.
- Washbrook, D.A.: *India 1818-1860: The Two Faces of Colonialism*, in *The oxford History of the British Empire, Vol.III, The Nineteenth Century*, OUP 1999, pp.395-421. (Washbrook 1999a)
- Washbrook, D.A.: *Orients and Occidents: Colonial Discourse Theory and the Historiography of the British Empire*, in *The oxford History of the British Empire, Vol.V, Historiography*, OUP 1999, pp.596-611.
- Waterhouse, D.M. (ed.): *The Origins of Himalayan Studies: Brian Houghton Hodgson in Nepal and Darjeeling 1820-1858*, London 2004.
- Weatherbee, D.E.: *Raffles' Sources for Traditional Javanese Historiography and the Mackenzie Collections*, in *Indonesia*, 26 (1978), pp.63-93.

- Weber, G.: *Science and Society in Nineteenth Century Anthropology*, in *History of Science*, 12:4 (1974), pp.260-283.
- Webster, A.: *Gentlemen Capitalists: British Imperialism in South East Asia 1770-1890*, London 1998.
- Webster, A.: *The Richest East India Merchant: The Life and Business of John Palmer of Calcutta 1767-1836*, Boydell Press 2007.
- Webster, A.: *The Development of British Commercial and Political Networks in the Straits Settlements 1800-1868: The Rise of a Colonial and Regional Economic Identity*, in *Modern Asian Studies*, 45:4 (2010), pp.899-929.
- Whelan, F.G.: *oriental Despotism: Anquetil-Duperron's Response to Montesquieu*, in *History of Political Thought*, Vol.XXII, No.4 (2001), pp.619-647.
- White, H.: *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Johns Hopkins University Press 1973.
- White, H.: *tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*, Johns Hopkins University Press 1978.
- Williams, G. & Frost, A. (eds.): *Terra Australis to Australia*, Melbourne (OUP) 1988.
- Williams, R.: *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*, 2. ed. London 1983. (org. 1976).
- Wilson, J.E.: *Agency, narrative, and Resistance*, in *Stockwell*, pp.245-268.
- Windisch, E.: *Geschichte der Sanskrit Philologie und indischen Altertumskunde*, 2 vols. (vol.I, Strassburg 1917; vol.II, Berlin und Leipzig 1920).
- Withers, C.W.J.: *Placing the Enlightenment: Thinking Geographically about the Age of Reason*, University of Chicago Press 2007.
- Withers, C.W.J.: *Place and the "Spatial Turn" in Geography and in History*, in *Journal of the History of Ideas* 70:4, 2009, pp.637-658.
- Withers, C.W.J.: *Scale and Geographies of Civic Science: Practice and Experience in the Meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Britain and Ireland, c.1845-1900*, in *Livingstone & Withers 2011*, pp.99-122.
- Withers, C.W.J, Finnegan, D, & Higgitt, R.: *Geography's Other Histories? Geography and Science in the British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1831-c.1933*, in *Transactions for the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series 31 (2006), pp.433-451.
- Withers, C.W.J. & Livingstone, D.N (eds.): *Geography and Enlightenment*, University of Chicago Press 1999.

- Withers, C.W.J. & Livingstone, D.N.: *Introduction: on Geography and Enlightenment*, in *Withers & Livingstone*.
- Wittfogel, K.: *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power*. Yale University Press 1957.
- Wolff, L. & Cipolloni, M. (eds.): *The Anthropology of the Enlightenment*, Stanford University Press 2007.
- Wood, P.B.: *The Natural History of Man in the Scottish Enlightenment*, in *History of Science*, 28:1 (Mar. 1990), pp.89-123.
- Wokler, R.: *Anthropology and conjectural History in the enlightenment*, in Fox, C., Porter, R. & Wokler, R. (eds.): *Inventing Human Science: Eighteenth-Century Domains*, University of California Press 1995.
- Wright, H.R.C.: *The Anglo-Dutch dispute in the East, 1814-1824*, in *The Economic History Review, New Series*, Vol.3, No.2 1950), pp.229-239.
- Wright, H.R.C.: *East-Indian Economic Problems of the Age of Cornwallis & Raffles*, London 1961.
- Wurtzburg, C.E.: *Raffles of the Eastern Isles*, Singapore OUP 1984 (org. 1954).
- Wyatt, D.K.: *Introduction*, to J. Crawford's *Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Courts of Siam and Cochin China*, reprinted by OUP 1966.
- Wyatt, D.K.: *Introduction*, to G. Finlayson's *Mission to Siam and Hué, 1821-1822*, reprinted by OUP 1988.
- Yanguas Álvarez de Toledo, Á.: *El catálogo de Hervás, el capitán Cook y las lenguas de Oceania*, in *Language Design*, Vol.3 (2000), pp.77-99.
- Yule, H.: *Notes on the Analogies Between the Indo-Chinese Races and the Races of the Indian Archipelago*, in *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol.9 (1880), pp.290-304.

### **Unpublished Doctoral Theses.**

- Augstein, F.A.: *James C. Prichard's Views of Mankind. An Anthropologist between Enlightenment and the Victorian Age*, University College London 1996.
- Knapman, G.: *Barbarian Nations in a Civilizing Empire: Naturalizing the Nation within the British Empire 1770-1870*, RMIT University 2007.
- Kumagai, Y.: *The Lobbying Activities of Provincial Mercantile and Manufacturing Interests against the Renewal of the East India Company's Charter, 1812-1813, and 1829-1833*, University of Glasgow 2008.

- Quilty, M.C.: *British economic Thought and Colonization in Southeast Asia, 1776-1850*, University of Sidney 2001.
- Tsao, T.M.: *Representing China to the British Public in the Age of Free Trade, c.1833-1844*, State University of New York at Stony Brook 2000.

### ***Unpublished Papers.***

- Barany, M.: *Prehistories of Counting*, 2009.<sup>1</sup>
- Barany, M.: *Savage Numbers: Counting, Race, and the Evolution of Civilization in Victorian Prehistory*, 2010.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This was the dissertation he delivered in order to obtain the degree of “Master of Philosophy in History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science, Technology and Medicine”, at St. John's College, University of Cambridge; it can be accessed online at: <http://www.princeton.edu/~mbarany/CambridgeCounting.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Accessed from the online version of his CV: <http://www.princeton.edu/~mbarany/BaranySavageNumbersSinger.pdf>